HE
6499
.A5
1912a

Class_____

Book_____

62D CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

DOCUMENT
No. 866

CHARLES H. QUACKENBUSH

LETTER FROM
THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

TRANSMITTING

IN RESPONSE TO SENATE RESOLUTION OF MAY 13, 1912, INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE DISCHARGE OF CHARLES H. QUACKENBUSH FROM THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE AND HIS REINSTATEMENT :: :: :: ::

JULY 1, 1912.—Referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1912

2

62D CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

DOCUMENT
No. 866

CHARLES H. QUACKENBUSH

628
40

LETTER FROM
THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

TRANSMITTING

IN RESPONSE TO SENATE RESOLUTION OF MAY 13, 1912, INFORMATION RELATIVE TO THE DISCHARGE OF CHARLES H. QUACKENBUSH FROM THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE AND HIS REINSTATEMENT :: :: :: ::

U. S. Post-Office Dept.

JULY 1, 1912.—Referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1912

HE6499
.A5
1912a

D OF T
JUL 12 1912

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1912.

The PRESIDENT UNITED STATES SENATE.

SIR: By direction of the President and in response to a resolution of the Senate dated the 13th ultimo, I have the honor to transmit herewith the correspondence in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the discharge of Charles H. Quackenbush from the Railway Mail Service and his reinstatement.

Respectfully,

FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH REFERENCE TO C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

Mar. 8, 1911. Copy of telegram from Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector advising of meeting on March 12 at Central Labor Union rooms.

Mar. 10, 1911. Copy of telegram from chief inspector to inspector in charge at Boston, requesting full particulars regarding above meeting.

Mar. 12, 1911. Copy of telegram from chief inspector to inspector in charge at Boston, requesting as soon as possible full results of secret meeting.

Mar. 13, 1911. Copy of telegram from Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector regarding meeting, and advising full report mailed.

Letter from Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector, inclosing clipping from the Boston Traveler of March 13 concerning Clerk Slocum.

Letter from Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector giving details of the meeting of March 12; how calls for meeting were issued; action of Railway Postal Clerk Quackenbush in meeting on February 12 of Railway Mail Clerks' Association; Exhibit A, alleged resolution made by Quackenbush at Railway Mail Clerks' Association meeting, March 12; Exhibit B, announcement of Quackenbush, dated March 12, of his candidacy for the position of president of the First Division Railway Mail Association.

Mar. 14, 1911. Memorandum of the chief inspector to the Postmaster General, submitting report of Inspector in Charge Letherman of March 13; copy of the Boston Traveler of the same date; and recommending removal of Quackenbush.

Mar. 15, 1911. Clipping from the Springfield (Mass.) Republican entitled "Railway association protest."

Mar. 20, 1911. Letter from Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector, inclosing a facing slip upon which appears, in alleged handwriting of Quackenbush, notice of meeting of March 12.

Mar. 21, 1911. Memorandum of chief inspector to Postmaster General, submitting letter of Inspector in Charge Letherman of March 20, together with said facing slip, and renewing recommendation for the immediate removal of Quackenbush. This memorandum was approved by the Postmaster General on March 21, 1911, and is initialed by "T. L. W."

Mar. 28, 1911. Memorandum for Mr. Weed by "A. L. D.," stating that he has read the papers relating to the case of Quackenbush and believes that the recommendation for his removal seems to be entirely warranted.

Mar. 30, 1911. Letter of chief clerk, Post Office Department, to the Second Assistant postmaster General informing him that the Postmaster General directs the immediate removal of Quackenbush.

Mar. 31, 1911. Memorandum of Second Assistant Postmaster General to the General Superintendent, Railway Mail Service, directing that an order be prepared for the removal of Quackenbush to comply with the Postmaster General's directions.

Railway Mail Service "removal" jacket covering case of Quackenbush.

Memorandum of chief inspector to Postmaster General, renewing the recommendation for the immediate removal of Quackenbush for reasons set forth in memorandum of March 14.

Apr. 4, 1911. Copy of letter of chief inspector to Inspector in Charge Letherman, requesting further investigation regarding Quackenbush, with especial reference to alleged fist fights.

Memorandums (two) by Acting General Superintendent Railway Mail Service Stone giving service record of Quackenbush and railway postal clerk Herbert F. French, to which rating cards are attached, said memorandums accompanying telegram addressed to the Postmaster General April 3, by Herbert F. French, requesting in behalf of railway-mail clerks first division consideration of order covering removal of Quackenbush.

Apr. 5, 1911. Letter from Quackenbush to Supt. Ryan acknowledging receipt of notice of removal and requesting to be informed if there is anything on the records justifying his removal.

Apr. 6, 1911. Reference from Supt. Ryan to General Superintendent Railway Mail Service of letter of Quackenbush of April 5, asking what reply should be made.

Letter from inspector in charge Letherman to the chief inspector, inclosing as Exhibit A affidavit of railway postal clerk H. W. Strong to the effect that Quackenbush assaulted him; Exhibit B, affidavit by George A. Wood, national secretary of the Railway Mail Association of the United States regarding the meeting of the first division, railway mail association, on February 12, and the one on March 12, and with reference to the attitude of Quackenbush; Exhibit C, statement of A. C. Walton defining his position in regard to the motives imputed to him; Exhibit D, exact copy of resolutions passed by the railway mail clerks' association February 12; Exhibit F, affidavit of railway postal clerk H. F. Tebbetts regarding meeting called for March 12 between railway postal clerks and representatives of labor organization; Exhibit E, affidavit of clerk Tebbetts, who was a member of the committee on resolutions at the meeting of February 12; Exhibit G, sample of literature being circulated by railway postal clerks at that time in the interest of Quackenbush for president of the New England association; Exhibit H, affidavit of A. C. Walton, president of the New England association, who presided at the regular meeting of March 12 and received from the hands of Quackenbush the resolution written by the latter, marked "Exhibit A," accompanying the report of inspector in charge Letherman of March 13. Inspector in charge Letherman makes further comment regarding Quackenbush and rumors with reference to A. C. Walton.

Apr. 11, 1911. Clippings from the Boston Traveler and the Boston American with reference to an injunction secured by Quackenbush restraining first division railway mail association from preventing him participating in the affairs of the association.

Apr. 12, 1911. Clipping from the Washington Evening Times with reference to New England postal clerks opposing the Government order against secret organizations.

Letter from inspector in charge Letherman to the chief inspector advising that the election of Quackenbush as president of the New England had been reported to him and inclosing clippings from the Boston Globe, Boston Daily Advertiser (Apr. 11 and 12), Boston Journal, Boston Evening Record, and the New Haven Evening Register of April 10.

Printed pamphlet issued by H. F. Tebbetts, clerk in charge Groveton and Boston railway post office, entitled "Fair Play."

Printed leaflet issued by H. F. Tebbetts, of the Groveton and Boston railway post office, addressed to the members of the first division railway mail association with reference to emergency assessment of $1 to pay the salary of Slocum and of Quackenbush.

Apr. 13, 1911. Copy of letter from chief inspector to inspector in charge at Boston requesting additional information regarding another fight of Quackenbush.

Memorandum for Mr. Weed by the chief inspector transmitting affidavit of Railway Postal Clerk John H. Hoskison covering the action of Quackenbush in striking Railway Postal Clerk Strong without provocation. Affidavit dated April 10 and transmitted to department with letter of Inspector in Charge Letherman, of April 12, to the chief inspector, inclosing communication from Acting Inspector in Charge Perkins dated April 10 to Inspector in Charge Letherman, submitting, in addition, affidavit dated April 8 of Louis F. Tapley, railway postal clerk, concerning an unimportant argument with Quackenbush and circular addressed to Hoskison which was sent to the railway postal clerk by Senator La Follette with a list of questions to be answered.

Apr. 14, 1911. Clipping from the Evening Herald entitled "Mail clerk makes plea to Hitchcock."

Apr. 15, 1911. Copy of a letter of Chief Clerk Weed to Quackenbush acknowledging receipt of his letter to the Postmaster General of April 5, which is attached, with reference to his removal from the service.

Apr. 17, 1911. Reference from Supt. Ryan to general superintendent Railway Mail Service, of letter from Quackenbush, which is attached, dated April 14, making application for reinstatement.

Apr. 18, 1911. Letter from Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector with reference to affidavits regarding Clerk Quackenbush, which were previously forwarded.

Apr. 21, 1911. Letter from Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector inclosing as Exhibit A, appeal of Quackenbush for money to support him while making fight for reinstatement; also attaching two letters dated February 9 and 14 from Railway Postal Clerk H. E. Slocum, addressed, respectively, "My Dear Tommy" and "Dear Tommy."

Letter of Chief Clerk Weed to Senator Lodge advising him of the cause of the removal of Quackenbush (copy of said letter), in response to letter from Senator Lodge, dated April 6, which is attached. There is also attached to Senator Lodge's communication a memorandum for the Postmaster General from the Second Assistant Postmaster General, submitting the communication from the Senator and advising of the call of Representative T. L. Reilly.

Copy of letter of Chief Clerk Weed to Senator F. B. Brandegee informing him of the cause of the removal of Quackenbush in response to his letter of April 8, which is attached, addressed to the general superintendent, Railway Mail Service.

Unsigned, undated, and not addressed memorandum with reference to Quackenbush's application for reinstatement; statements from others in his behalf; announcement of his candidacy for first division, R. M. A. presidency, dated March 9, and copy of resolutions which he indorsed.

Apr. 26, 1911. Copy of letter of Acting Chief Clerk Davis to Representative E. W. Higgins acknowledging receipt of the latter's letter of April 21, inclosing a copy of resolutions adopted by the board of common council of the city of Stamford, Conn., with reference to the removal of Quackenbush, both of which are attached.

May 6, 1911. Telegram from Herbert M. Chase to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, claiming that Quackenbush was opposed to organization of labor in Post Office Department and requesting conference with Second Assistant.

Copy of reply of Second Assistant to above telegram advising that he would be able to see him Tuesday.

May 9, 1911. Copy of letter of chief inspector to Inspector in Charge Letherman regarding call at the office of Quackenbush's attorney, who made certain statements concerning the proceedings of the meetings on February 12 and March 12 and requesting the inspector in charge to obtain affidavits concerning what took place at the two meetings.

Memorandum of the chief inspector, addressed to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, reviewing the conduct of Quackenbush.

Letter of the chief inspector to the Second Assistant Postmaster General transmitting the above-mentioned memorandum.

Report of Inspector O'Brien of the New York division giving the result of his inquiry as to the assault of Quackenbush upon a driver of a mail wagon in New York, submitted in response to the request of the chief inspector of April 7, which is attached. The inspector submits with his report letter of Supt. Ryan, of the Railway Mail Service, dated April 12, stating that he has no personal knowledge of the altercation in question and inclosing list of clerks and ex-clerks who run with Quackenbush since April, 1908. The letter of Inspector in Charge Dickson of April 10, assigning to Inspector O'Brien the investigation of this matter, is attached.

May 11, 1911. Letter of Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector transmitting an exact copy of the record of the First Division, Railway Mail Association, of March 12, and affidavit of Railway Postal Clerk H. F. French, dated May 11, to the effect that they are the complete records of the meeting, also exact copies of a portion of the records of the meeting of February 12, and affidavit of H. R. Stoddard, dated May 11, to the effect that they are exact copies; exact copies of all the resolutions which were passed and which Quackenbush offered as a resolution to be sent to certain officers of the Post Office Department, the chairman of the Post Office Committee, and the "railway

post office"; also signature of Quackenbush taken from a letter addressed to the secretary of the association.

May 12, 1911. Reference from the chief inspector to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, transmitting a letter of Inspector in Charge Letherman of May 11, referred to next above, and correspondence submitted therewith.

May 18, 1911. Memorandum of the second assistant to the general superintendent Railway Mail Service, with reference to certain statistics requested by Quackenbush and returning to general superintendent his memorandum of May 9, which is attached, submitting for decision the request of Quackenbush, dated May 2, for the data transmitted to the general superintendent by Supt. Ryan on May 3, both of the latter communications being attached.

May 20, 1911. Clipping from a periodical headed "First Division Notice" and signed by H. R. Stoddard as secretary, urging the payment of the extra assessment of $1.

May 25, 1911. Letter from Inspector in Charge Letherman to the chief inspector, inclosing handwriting of Quackenbush in the form of two letters with envelopes addressed to A. C. Walton on January 12, 1911, and January 18, 1911. The inspector in charge also furnishes information concerning a meeting of the association on May 21.

May 26, 1911. Copy of letter from chief inspector to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, transmitting samples of handwriting of Quackenbush, namely, his letters to Walton of January 12 and 18, the notice of a meeting of railway postal clerks on March 12 issued by Quackenbush on a facing slip, and the report of Inspector in Charge Letherman of May 25, relating to this matter.

Letter of Post Office Inspector M. C. Duryea to the chief inspector, inclosing a copy of circular issued by Herbert M. Chase on May 22, 1911, embodying certain inquiries to be answered by clerks in the first division, Railway Mail Service.

May 27, 1911. Letter of the chief inspector to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, transmitting the letter of May 26 from Inspector Duryea and the circular from Mr. Chase.

Four hundred and twenty-nine replies to the circular issued by Attorney Chase on May 22 concerning Quackenbush's conduct.

June 1, 1911. Nine-page affidavit of Quackenbush reviewing his conduct and urging his reinstatement. The following papers are submitted with the affidavit: Exhibit A, letter of May 31 of William H. Jones, Stamford, Conn., regarding the character of Quackenbush; Exhibit A1, copy of letter dated May 29 of Miner, Read & Tullock, of New Haven, Conn., addressed to the Second Assistant Postmaster General; Exhibit A2, letter of M. W. Flemming of May 31, addressed to the Second Assistant; Exhibit A3, unsigned letter dated May 31, on the letterhead of the "Director, Merchants' Steamboat Line of Stamford, Conn.," addressed to the Second Assistant, all in behalf of Quackenbush's standing; Exhibit B, copy and original of petition for reinstatement signed by several hundred railway postal clerks; Exhibit C, copy and original statement signed by supervisory officers of the first division, Railway Mail Service, giving an expression as to the conduct of Quackenbush; Exhibit D, copy and original letter of George A. Wood, secretary Railway Mail Association, addressed to Quackenbush on April 8, 1911, advising that his membership in said association had been canceled; Exhibit E, affidavit of May 6, 1911, of George A. Wood, to the effect that there was on file letter addressed to him as secretary of the Railway Mail Association, dated April 7, from A. C. Walton, president of the first division, recommending the removal of Quackenbush from the association; Exhibit F, clipping from the Boston Post of April 12, 1911, and typewritten copy thereof, reporting the election of Quackenbush as president of the first division, Railway Mail Association; Exhibit G, original and copy of pamphlet issued March 16, 1911, by Quackenbush, addressed "Fellow members of the Railway Mail Association, attention," in the interest of his candidacy for president of the first division, Railway Mail Association. On the reverse of the original there appears a copy of his original announcement; Exhibit H, copy and original affidavit of Henry H. Branchaud, dated May 31, 1911, with reference to Quackenbush's attitude in

the matter of railway postal clerks striking or affiliating with labor organizations, said Branchaud claiming to have roomed with Quackenbush in the dormitory at Boston; Exhibit I, copy and original letter from H. R. Stoddard, secretary first division, Railway Mail Association, dated May 8, 1911, to the effect that he never heard Quackenbush mention the American Federation of Labor—this communication is addressed to Quackenbush; Exhibit J, copy of resolutions of February 12, 1911; Exhibit K, letter from H. R. Stoddard, secretary first division, Railway Mail Association, dated May 31, 1911, addressed to Quackenbush, quoting from the minutes of the meeting of March 12, 1911, relative to the withdrawal of the resolution offered by Quackenbush; Exhibit L, affidavit and copy of Herbert M. Chase, dated May 31, 1911, certifying to the correctness of a copy of an affidavit quoted in full, signed by a railway mail clerk, to the effect that Quackenbush informed him that he had positively refused to offer the said Slocum resolution, although urged to do so by Slocum; Exhibit M, copy of Quackenbush's announcement of March 9, 1911, of his candidacy for the position of president of the first division, Railway Mail Association; Exhibit N, copy and original of letter dated May 21, 1911, addressed to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, regarding the conduct of Quackenbush, signed by "all or nearly all of the clerks present" at the meeting of May 21, 1911—the original affidavit bears the signatures of 33 persons and consists of three sheets; Exhibit O, copy and original letter, dated May 28, 1911, from John E. Brennan to Herbert M. Chase, regarding the conduct of Quackenbush.

Copy of letter from the Second Assistant Postmaster General to S. H. Read, New Haven, Conn., acknowledging receipt of his letter of May 29, 1911, addressed to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, regarding the character of Quackenbush, said letter from Read being attached.

June 2, 1911. Letter from Herbert M. Chase to Second Assistant Postmaster General to which is attached a copy of his letter of May 22, 1911, to the clerks of the first division, Railway Mail Association, with reference to the replies received from the clerks to the said circular and urging a favorable decision on the application of Quackenbush for reinstatement.

June 3, 1911. Telegram from Chase to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, inquiring when answer may be expected in Quackenbush case.

Copy of telegram from Second Assistant Postmaster General to H. M. Chase advising absence from city of Postmaster General and of his inability to say when case would be taken up.

June 9, 1911. Letter from Dr. R. Hertzberg, of Stamford, Conn., addressed to the Second Assistant as to the character of Quackenbush and in behalf of his reinstatement.

June 10, 1911. Copy of letter of Second Assistant to Dr. R. Hertzberg, Stamford, Conn., acknowledging receipt of his letter of June 9 listed immediately preceding.

June 19, 1911. Letter from Herbert M. Chase to the Second Assistant pressing for a report in the Quackenbush case.

June 21, 1911. Copy of letter of Second Assistant addressed to H. M. Chase acknowledging receipt of his letter of June 19, listed immediately preceding.

June 20, 1911. Letter from George H. Fair, Topeka, Kans., addressed to the Second Assistant with reference to the conduct of Quackenbush at a convention of railway postal clerks in Syracuse, N. Y.

June 23, 1911. Copy of letter of Second Assistant to George H. Fair, railway postal clerk, Topeka, Kans., acknowledging receipt of letter listed immediately preceding.

June 26, 1911. Communication from chief inspector to Second Assistant transmitting report of Inspector C. M. Perkins, dated June 22, addressed to Inspector in Charge Letherman covering his investigation of certain features embodied in the letter of April 12, 1911, addressed to Supt. Ryan by the executive committee of the first division, Railway Mail Association, which is attached. There are also attached reference from Supt. Ryan dated April 12 of the letter of the executive committee, to the General Superintendent Railway Mail Service; another reference dated April 12 from Supt. Ryan to the General Superintendent Railway Mail Service, of a clipping from the Boston

Daily Advertiser of April 12 headed, "Railway mail clerks elect Quackenbush;" reference of general superintendent to Second Assistant of April 13 of the newspaper clipping recommending reference of papers to the Chief Inspector for investigation; reference of general superintendent to Second Assistant of April 14 of a communication of the newly elected executive committee of the first division, Railway Mail Association, recommending reference of papers to Chief Inspector for investigation; memorandum of Second Assistant to General Superintendent Railway Mail Service, dated April 15 returning the references of April 13 and 14 with approval of recommendation; reference of Second Assistant to chief inspector dated April 17 requesting investigation of conditions set forth in correspondence. There is attached to these papers a memorandum addressed to "Mr. Ingalls" signed by "Stewart" to the effect that the latter has the Quackenbush papers on his desk.

Letter from M. H. Chase to the Second Assistant urging a decision on Quackenbush's application.

June 28, 1911. Copy of letter of Second Assistant to H. M. Chase acknowledging receipt of his letter listed immediately preceding.

July 31, 1911. Letter from H. M. Chase addressed to the Postmaster General relative to the case of Quackenbush, urging a decision.

Aug. 1, 1911. Copy of letter from the acting private secretary to H. M. Chase acknowledging receipt of his letter to the Postmaster General listed immediately preceding.

Aug. 29, 1911. Memorandum of the Second Assistant addressed to the Postmaster General reviewing the conduct of Quackenbush, in the whole favorable to his reinstatement (a three-page memorandum).

Oct. 28, 1911. Letter from P. J. Schardt, president Railway Mail Association, Milwaukee, Wis., to chief inspector suggesting the reinstatement of Quackenbush. This is a six-page letter.

Oct. 31, 1911. Copy of letter from chief inspector to P. J. Schardt, Milwaukee, Wis., acknowledging receipt of letter listed immediately preceding.

Letter of chief inspector to Second Assistant transmitting letter of October 28 from P. J. Schardt and copy of a reply of the chief inspector.

Nov. 6, 1911. Memorandum of General Superintendent Railway Mail Service, to Second Assistant submitting correspondence from P. J. Schardt recommending that Quackenbush be not reinstated. This memorandum bears the indorsement as follows: "I have made a recommendation to the Postmaster General in each case. Stewart."

Jan. 18, 1912. Nineteen-page memorandum of chief inspector addressed to the Postmaster General reviewing exhaustively the conduct of Quackenbush and giving reasons in detail for the recommendation that Quackenbush be not reinstated and that his application be given no further consideration.

Mar. 11, 1912. Copy of three-page memorandum of A. L. Davis addressed to the Postmaster General giving succinctly his views of the case after having considered it very carefully. He touches on the civil-service rule governing the reinstatement of employees removed for cause, and concludes that the charges against Quackenbush are clearly shown to have been true and that the department is unable to say that the removal was not justified or that same punishment would not be inflicted in a similar case.

Mar. 13, 1912. Copy of eight-page memorandum of the Second Assistant addressed to the Postmaster General giving wherein, in his opinion, the statements made by A. L. Davis in the Quackenbush case, as to the facts which he believes are proven by the record, are incorrect.

Mar. 16, 1912. Copy of four-page memorandum of A. L. Davis addressed to the Postmaster General reviewing the memorandum of the Second Assistant listed immediately preceding and submitting arguments in answer to the statements of the Second Assistant.

Mar. 25, 1912. Copy of memorandum of chief inspector to the Postmaster General giving information regarding conditions which might have resulted from the dismissal from the service of Quackenbush and stating that it is the unanimous opinion of the inspectors of the Boston division that there has been a complete change of feeling of the clerks toward the department, and that Inspector in Charge Letherman is strongly

of the opinion that the dismissal of Quackenbush and the firm attitude of the department in refusing to reinstate him have had an exceedingly good effect in stopping agitation, strife, and discord in that Railway Mail Service division.

Copy of memorandum of chief inspector to the Postmaster General with reference to the conduct of Quackenbush at the national convention and in general opposed to his reinstatement on the grounds that other clerks who were similarly treated will demand reinstatement.

Mar. 30, 1912. Letter of Inspector in Charge Letherman to chief inspector inclosing affidavit of John J. Kennedy, railway postal clerk, dated March 29, which establishes the fact that Quackenbush attended the meeting in March, 1911, at which the organizers of the American Federation of Labor met with the railway postal clerks.

Apr. 22, 1912. Copy of Executive Order No. 1521 directing that Quackenbush may be reinstated.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH REFERENCE TO C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 8, 1911.*

CHIEF POST OFFICE INSPECTOR,
Washington, D. C.

Truly soon will report a the cannot the whether for McCarthy England railway labor four on afternoon rooms clerks meet organizer purpose clerks of an but there proceedings you I yours as wire the man meeting get federation the the general will mail union o'clock March at Boston of frank labor of will labor inspector will who to fully receive information as me will have into I join deciding union H new the central twelve.

LETHERMAN.

[Translation.]

On March 12, 4 o'clock afternoon, at Central Labor Union rooms, Boston, the railway mail clerks of New England will meet Frank H. McCarthy, general organizer, labor union, for the purpose of deciding whether the clerks will join the Federation of Labor. I can not get an inspector into the meeting, but will have a man there who will have a man there who will report the proceedings to me. Will wire you fully as soon as I receive information.

MARCH 10, 1911.

POST OFFICE INSPECTOR IN CHARGE,
Boston, Mass.

Leaders twelfth of get instant your not particulars clerks names etc. including postal full do wire fail of on of ring March meeting to eighth.

SHARP.

[Translation.]

Your wire 8th instant; do not fail to get full particulars of meeting of postal clerks on March 12, including names of ringleaders, etc.

MARCH 12, 1911.

POST OFFICE INSPECTOR IN CHARGE,
Boston, Mass.

Names to-day practicable telegraph results postal leaders railway full soon secret clerks furnishing meeting as.

SHARP.

[Translation.]

Telegraph soon as practicable full results secret meeting to-day railway postal clerks, furnishing names leaders.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 13, 1911.*

CHIEF POST OFFICE INSPECTOR,
Washington, D. C.

To-day with only clerks meeting federation attempted information respectfully important partially with railway labor full mailed you report yesterday mail.

LETHERMAN.

[Translation.]

Meeting of railway mail clerks with Federation of Labor yesterday was only partially attempted. Full report mailed you to-day.

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., March 13, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP, *Chief Inspector,*
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I was informed early in the day that, as a result of the resolutions offered in the regular meeting of the New England Association of Railway Mail Clerks yesterday afternoon, in regard to Clerk Slocum, recently removed, that an article would undoubtedly appear in the afternoon edition of the Boston Traveler. I have just secured a copy of the Boston Traveler and have marked the article referred to and hand same to you herewith.

I shall endeavor to ascertain who allowed himself to be interviewed by the Traveler, and will inform you as soon as possible of any information I may be able to obtain.

Very respectfully, LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

[The Boston Traveler, Monday, March 13, 1911.]

MAIL CLERKS FIGHT FOR COMRADE—NEW ENGLAND DIVISION, RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION, DEMAND HEARING FOR CLERK DISMISSED FOR VIOLATING HITCHCOCK "GAG" RULE.

The railway-mail clerks of New England to-day took open issue with the Post Office Department, demanding that a hearing, with counsel present, be given Harry E. Slocum, of Springfield, who, a few days ago, was dismissed without a hearing for, as they believe, criticizing the "gag" rule which Postmaster General Hitchcock began enforcing soon after his "economy" policy became unpopular with the public.

ADOPT RESOLVE.

The demand for a hearing for Mr. Slocum was made in the form of resolutions adopted, by a unanimous vote, at a meeting attended by 200 mail clerks of the New England division, at Castle Hall, Boston, last evening.

The resolutions, which were telegraphed to Alexander Grant, general superintendent of the Railway Mail Service, at Washington, read:

Whereas one of our number has been removed from the service, and
Whereas no charges were brought, no defense allowed, and an appeal is not granted, and
Whereas said member claims he is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Therefore, be it
Resolved, That we, members of the first division, Railway Mail Association, assembled in special meeting, at Boston, this 12th day of March, 1911, do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought against him.

SETS A PRECEDENT.

Although Mr. Slocum did not receive notice of his dismissal until last Thursday night, every railway-mail clerk who was in Boston last night arranged to be at the meeting.

Said one of the clerks to-day:

The action was unanimous, for a vital principle is at stake. Mr. Slocum is the first Railway Mail Service employee to be dismissed without a hearing. That action is in direct contravention of civil-service regulations, which heretofore have been the safeguard of every man in the employ of the civil-service branches of the Government. We will take the case as far as possible in the effort to secure justice for Mr. Slocum.

Mr. Slocum, who was in Boston to-day, said of the case:

I don't know what I was dismissed for. I can only surmise, as my former associates in the service do, that it was due to a phrase which I used in announcing myself a candidate for delegate to the convention of the Railway Mail Association, which is to be held at Syracuse, N. Y., next June.

My announcement, which was published in the Railway Postoffice, the official publication of the association, read as follows:

"I wish to announce that I am a candidate for delegate to the convention of the Railway Mail Association, to be held at Syracuse, N. Y., June 6, 1911.

"I believe in the fullest publicity in all legislative work and condemn the past methods of secrecy.

"I also believe that we should have an official paper that represents all the clerks, and not a few who are on the executive committee.

"I also believe that we should have a representative who can neither be bought, fired, nor told that he is out of place, to look after any legislation affecting our service and to present our case to Congress in such a way as to secure us justice.

WOULD REPEAL "GAG" RULE.

"I am in favor of the repeal of the Executive order or 'gag' rule, which denies us rights and privileges guaranteed us by the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. Grant's notice of dismissal to me made no statement of specific cause. "For conduct detrimental to the welfare of the service," it read.

I want it understood that there is no stigma attached to my name in connection with my removal from the service. There can be no disgrace, for I have done nothing wrong. All I did was to express myself against the gag rule. There can be no other charge against me.

Mr. Slocum returned to his home, at 19 Ringgold Street, Springfield, to await the further action of the Post Office Department.

While none of the clerks who attended the meeting would say so in so many words, several gave the intimation that if a hearing is denied Mr. Slocum the matter will be made the subject of a resolution of inquiry in the coming extra session of Congress.

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 14, 1911.

I beg to submit herewith the report of Inspector in Charge Letherman of March 13 relative to the proposed meeting between the railway mail clerks of New England and Frank H. McCarthy, general organizer of the American Federation of Labor, or as the inspector in charge terms him "general organizer of the labor union."

It appears from this report that Railway Postal Clerk C. H. Quackenbush is the leading spirit in the movement to organize the postal clerks in a union and that he has been a disturbing element among the clerks in the New England section.

I inclose copy of the Boston Traveler of March 13 which contains a sensational article embodying resolutions which no doubt were prepared with the assistance of Quackenbush.

I believe that this clerk has been disloyal to the department and to his superior officers, that he has been and is creating strife and discord among the railway postal clerks, and that the best interests of the service warrant his separation therefrom. I respectfully recommend that he be peremptorily removed.

R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector.

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., March 13, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Following my cipher telegram of to-day, in reference to the proposed meeting between the railway mail clerks of New England and Frank H. McCarthy, general organizer of the labor union, I have the honor to submit the following:

Yesterday (Sunday) afternoon C. H. Quackenbush and three other railway mail clerks met Frank H. McCarthy, general organizer of the labor union, at the rooms of that association. The meeting, however, was not held at that time, and I am informed for the reason that there was a regular meeting of the New England association being held at the same time in another part of the city. It is thought that Quackenbush met McCarthy to inform him that their meeting would be held after the adjournment of the regular meeting, but, inasmuch as the regular meeting did not adjourn until 10.15 p. m., it is presumed that it was too late for them to hold the meeting between certain clerks and the labor union. However, it is thought that such a meeting will be held later, and in case it is I will endeavor to ascertain what steps are taken in that meeting.

The call for this meeting with McCarthy was written out on facing slips, although there were some printed cards, and these were given to the clerks. The handwriting on the facing slips was the same as the handwriting of the man who wrote the attached resolution, written in pencil, marked by me as "Exhibit A." This resolution, as indicated in "Exhibit A," was one made by C. H. Quackenbush at the regular meeting yesterday, but the same did not pass. I saw

one of the original slips, and the handwriting was the same as the handwriting on the attached resolution.

Quackenbush is the clerk who, in the regular meeting of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association of New England, on February 12, fought for the word "demand" to remain in the resolution in the committee on resolutions, of which he was a member, and forced the committee to report same to the meeting, and he still maintains his position as far as that is concerned, as is indicated in the attached circular in which he announces himself as a candidate for president of the association, and which I have marked "Exhibit B." You will notice that I have underlined in this exhibit the following:

I accept and indorse every word of the resolutions adopted at the meeting held in Boston on February 12.

Yesterday, after meeting McCarthy, Quackenbush appeared at the regular meeting of the association and "Exhibit A" is the resolution in his own handwriting which he offered in regard to Harry Slocum, a railway mail clerk who was recently removed from the service. After he had offered this resolution, Slocum, who is still a member of the association, although removed from the service, obtained the floor and offered the following resolution as a substitute for the one offered by Quackenbush:

Whereas one of our members has been removed from the service; and
Whereas no charges were brought and no defense allowed, and appeal is not granted; and
Whereas said member claims he is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Be it therefore
Resolved, That we, the members of the First Division Railway Mail Association, do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought.

This is copied from the original, written in the handwriting of Mr. Slocum, and the original can be obtained at any time, although I am not at liberty to send it in at present.

After Mr. Slocum had read his substitute for the resolution offered by Quackenbush, he asked Quackenbush if he had any objection to his (Slocum's) substitute, and Mr. Quackenbush said he had no objection whatever. Although some of the clerks objected to this resolution, Quackenbush demanded that the yea-and-nay vote on the Slocum resolution, which he (Quackenbush) accepted as a substitute for his own resolution, be recorded as unanimous, and it was so recorded.

There is no doubt in my mind but what Quackenbush is at the head of most of the disturbances in this branch of the Railway Mail Service Association. He is known as a disturber. Some time ago, in New York, he got into a fist fight with the driver of a mail wagon, a man about half Quackenbush's size, physically, but Quackenbush received a severe drubbing. Within the last month he got into another fist fight with a clerk by the name of Strong, in the Railway Mail Service dormitory in this building. Strong is a clerk who either runs in Quackenbush's crew or on the same route.

In this connection I desire to say that I am receiving my information to a great extent from Mr. A. C. Walton, president of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association of New England. Mr. Walton is not

in sympathy at all with such actions as have been recorded in this report, and I think I can rely upon him for further information.

There is no doubt in my mind but what Quackenbush will try to ally the belligerent members of the Railway Mail Service with the Federation of Labor.

I shall continue to endeavor to obtain further information and will keep you posted promptly upon receipt of any information bearing upon the matter.

Very respectfully, LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

EXHIBIT A.

Resolved, That whereas the general superintendent has summarily removed from the service Clerk Harry E. Slocum, we feel that in order that we, as clerks, may conduct ourselves in a manner wholly acceptable to the department that the reasons for the dismissal of this clerk be given publicity.

EXHIBIT B.

STAMFORD, CONN., *March 9, 1911.*

Fellow members of the first division, Railway Mail Association:

After due consideration, I beg to announce that I am a candidate for the office of president of your honorable body. In connection with this announcement I wish to say that I have not asked the permission of nor consulted with any living being, and therefore am not pledged in any way to any man, nor will I be, and only to such measures as I now do, or later will, publicly indorse. *I accept and indorse every word of the resolutions adopted at the meeting held in Boston on February 12.* I believe fully in both the justice and expediency of "Service promotion," and will endeavor to impress upon the clerks themselves first, and later the department and the public, the reasonableness and advisability of this great epoch-marking change. I am in favor of the "Goulden retirement bill." I am not in favor of making the Harpoon our association paper, believing that our own paper, the Railway Post Office, under its present editor, Mr. Kidwell, will prove entirely satisfactory.

I believe that all our requests for better conditions are founded in reason and justice and, if granted, will result in an increased efficiency fully commensurate with the cost and are therefore in line with an enlightened public policy.

As to where I stand on any other question, I will answer anyone at any time. In conclusion, I have no personal ambitions to be attained through this office other than to advance the interests of all clerks of the R. M. S., and only hope to benefit personally to the same extent that all are benefited.

Fraternally, yours, C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
Boston, Springfield, and New York R. P. O.

N. B.—I have been asked, "would I withdraw in favor of a stronger (?) candidate should one be forthcoming?" My answer is, Positively no. And I promise those who support my candidacy that I will stick until the last ballot is counted and make an aggressive fight all the way.

C. H. Q.

[Springfield (Mass.) Republican, March 15, 1911.]

RAILWAY ASSOCIATION PROTEST AGAINST "FIRING" OF H. S. SLOCUM—POST OFFICE "GAG RULE" DENOUNCED IN RESOLUTIONS.

The railway mail clerks of the New England division of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association, at a meeting held in Castle Garden, Boston, Sunday evening, took open issue with the Post Office Department and demanded that a hearing, with counsel present, be given Harry S. Slocum, of this city, who was dismissed from the postal service last Thursday, for, as the association asserts, openly criticizing the "gag rule," which they charge Postmaster General Hitchcock with enforcing. The demand for a hearing was made in the form

of resolutions. The resolutions, which were sent to Alexander Grant, general superintendent of the Railway Mail Service at Washington, read:

Whereas one of our number has been removed from the service; and
Whereas no charges were brought, no defense allowed, and an appeal is not granted; and
Whereas said member claims he is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Therefore be it
Resolved, That we, members of the first division of Railway Mail Association, assembled in special meeting at Boston, this 12th day of March, 1911, do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought against him.

It is the contention of the clerks that Mr. Slocum is the first Railway Mail Service employee to be dismissed without a hearing, and that this action in itself is in direct opposition to the civil-service regulations. The reason assigned for Mr. Slocum's dismissal was an article which appeared in the Railway Post Office, the official publication for the mail clerks' association, and in which he announced his candidacy as a delegate to the convention of the Railway Mail Association to be held in Syracuse, N. Y., in June. The announcement read as follows:

I wish to announce that I am a candidate for delegate to the convention of the Railway Mail Association, to be held at Syracuse, N. Y., June 6, 1911.
I believe in the fullest publicity in all legislative work and condemn the past methods of secrecy.
I also believe that we should have an official paper that represents all the clerks, and not a few who are on the executive committee.
I also believe that we should have a representative who can neither be bought, fired, nor told that he is out of place, to look after any legislation affecting our service and to present our case to Congress in such a way as to secure us justice.
I am in favor of the repeal of the executive order or "gag rule" which denies us rights and privileges guaranteed us by the Constitution of the United States.

The notice of dismissal received from Superintendent Grant stated that he was discharged from the service "for conduct detrimental to the welfare of the service."

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., March 20, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring to my confidential letter to you last week, in reference to the action of C. H. Quackenbush, railway mail clerk of the New England division, attempting to ally the New England division with the labor union of this city, I hand you herewith a facing slip upon which appears, in the handwriting of Quackenbush, the notice of the meeting. This is the slip referred to in my letter, which I did not have at that time, but have since obtained.

Very respectfully,

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

On March 12, at 4 p. m. Central Labor Union Rooms, 873 Washington Street, Boston. Meeting. (All invited.)

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 21, 1911.

Referring to my memorandum of the 14th instant submitting report of Inspector in Charge Letherman of March 13 relative to the proposed meeting at Boston of railway postal clerks with Frank H. McCarthy, general organizer of the American Federation of Labor, in which I recommended that Railway Postal Clerk C. H. Quackenbush be peremptorily removed from the service on account of his disloyalty and disposition to create strife and discord among the railway postal clerks, I beg to submit herewith communication of the inspector in charge at Boston inclosing a facing slip upon which appears, in the handwriting of Quackenbush, a notice of the meeting.

I renew my recommendation for the immediate removal of Quackenbush, provided he has not already been separated from the service.

Chief Inspector.

Approved, March 21, 1911:
F. H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General.

[Memorandum for Mr. Weed.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CLERK,
Washington, March 28, 1911.

I have read very carefully the accompanying papers relating to the case of C. H. Quackenbush, clerk in the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office. There seems to be no doubt that, as the chief inspector states, Mr. Quackenbush "is the leading spirit in the movement to organize the postal clerks in a union and that he has been a disturbing element among the clerks in the New England section." The recommendation that he be removed from the service seems to be entirely warranted by the facts in the case.

A. L. D.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 30, 1911.

SIR: The Postmaster General directs the immediate removal of Railway Postal Clerk C. H. Quackenbush, of the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office, it appearing from the reports submitted that such action is in the best interests of the service.

Respectfully,

T. L. WEED, *Chief Clerk.*

The SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

[Memorandum.]

MARCH 31, 1911.

Mr. GRANT,
General Superintendent Railway Mail Service.

Complying with the Postmaster General's direction in accompanying letter, prepare order of removal of C. H. Quackenbush, railway railway postal clerk, for the good of the service.

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE—REMOVAL.

The removal and the discontinuance of the pay of Charles H. Quackenbush, railway postal clerk, class 4, with pay at the rate of $1,200 per annum, between Boston, Springfield, Mass., and New York, N. Y., are hereby recommended.

For conduct detrimental to the welfare of the service.

Pay office, Stamford, Conn.

ALEX. GRANT,
General Superintendent.

Ordered:

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Date of order, March 31, 1911.

Notice to postmaster and to clerk through office of superintendent, same date.

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 31, 1911.

For the reasons set forth in my memorandum to you under date of March 14, 1911, I recommend the immediate dismissal of C. H. Quackenbush, a railway postal clerk on the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office, operating under the jurisdiction of the superintendent of the first division, Railway Mail Service, on account of his disloyalty and his creating strife among other railway postal clerks.

R. S. SHARP, *Chief Inspector.*

Approved, March 31, 1911.

———— ————,
Postmaster General.

[Confidential.]

APRIL 4, 1911.

SIR: Confirming my long-distance conversation with you this morning, I transmit herewith facing slip upon which appears the handwriting of Railway Postal Clerk C. H. Quackenbush, of the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office.

Please make a thorough investigation at the earliest possible moment along the lines mentioned in our telephone conversation, and, in addition to the points to be covered as suggested at that time, I think it would not be amiss for you to inquire into the fist fights which this clerk has indulged in, ascertaining the provocation for his several encounters. Your report of March 13 indicates that Quackenbush is of a quarrelsome disposition and has had two or three fistic encounters recently.

Very respectfully,

———— ————,
Chief Inspector.

Hon. LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge, Boston, Mass.

[Memorandum.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 4, 1911.

Charles H. Quackenbush was born in 1867, appointed to the Railway Mail Service May 23, 1898, from New Haven, Conn., and was removed by order of March 31, 1911, "for conduct detrimental to the welfare of the service." At that time he was a clerk in the Boston, Providence and New York railway post office, salary $1,200 per annum. His detailed ratings will be found on the attached card.

G. F. STONE,
Acting General Superintendent.

RATING OF RAILWAY POST OFFICE CLERKS.

Name, Charles H. Quackenbush; date, April 4, 1911.
Railway post office, Boston, Springfield and New York; year of birth, 1867; salary, $1,200; date appointed, May 23, 1898; appointed from New Haven, Conn.
Case examinations, 93; work in car, 94; habits, 95; attendance, 95; application, 93; ability in present grade, 93; general merit, 94; average, 93; health, 95; injured on duty, no; physical condition, 95; soldier or sailor, no.

[Memorandum.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 4, 1911.

Herbert F. French was born in 1866, entered the Railway Mail Service August 29, 1892, from South Easton, Mass., is now a clerk in charge in the Boston, Providence, and New York railway post office at a salary of $1,500 per annum. His detailed rating is shown in the attached card. He was on duty in the office of the chief clerk at Boston for about four years, ending in November, 1905, when he was reassigned to road duty at his own request.

G. F. STONE,
Acting General Superintendent.

RATING OF RAILWAY POSTAL CLERKS.

Name, Herbert F. French; date, April 4, 1911.
Railway post offices, Boston, Providence, and New York; year of birth, 1866; salary, $1,500; date appointed, August 29, 1892; appointed from South Easton, Mass.
Case examinations, 95; work in car, 95; habits, 95; attendance, 95; application, 95; ability in present grade, 95; general merit, 95; adaptability for promotion—executive ability, 95; clerical ability, 95; personal address, 95; average, 95; health, 95; injured on duty, no; physical condition, 95; soldier or sailor, no.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 3, 1911.*

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.:

Railway mail clerks, first division, respectfully ask your consideration of order general superintendent March 31, removing Charles H. Quackenbush, now an active candidate for president First Division Branch Railway Mail Association. They feel sure there has been a gross mistake or misrepresentation made somewhere, as Quackenbush most loyal to your administration, and ask that action on this order be postponed until facts can be presented to you by representatives of the larger lines in this division.

HERBERT F. FRENCH,
118 Highland Street, Hyde Park, Mass.

STAMFORD, CONN., *April 5, 1911.*

E. J. RYAN,
Superintendent, Boston, Mass.

SIR: Papers notifying me of my removal and instructing me as to the disposition of my badge, key, etc., have been received.

This is a total surprise, since I positively know of no act of mine that could be construed as "conduct detrimental to the welfare of the service."

I have endeavored at all times to so conduct myself both as a clerk and as a man that I should deserve the confidence and esteem of my superiors and certainly have the approbation of my own conscience.

Please inform me if there is anything on the records that could in any way be construed as reflecting on my character as a clerk or as a man, or that would justify my removal.

Very respectfully, C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 6, 1911.

Referred to General Superintendent Railway Mail Service, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Quackenbush's record is clear here.

What reply shall I make to him?

Mr. Stewart says not in favor of.

EDW. J. RYAN,
Superintendent.

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 6, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to hand you herewith affidavit made by Harry W. Strong, railway postal clerk, Boston, Springfield and New York Railway Post Office, same being marked "Exhibit A." Mr. Strong states that Charles H. Quackenbush, a clerk in the same railway post office as Strong, while under the influence of liquor in the post-office building in Boston, Mass., as a result of some trivial jesting, assaulted Strong, striking him several times on the head and blackening his eye, taking advantage of Strong while the latter was in a sitting posture and unable to defend himself.

Some time ago, in the city of New York, I am informed that Quackenbush assaulted the driver of a mail wagon, and that, although much smaller than Quackenbush, the driver gave him a good beating.

I am stating these matters to you to corroborate the statement made in my report of March 13 last, that Quackenbush is a disturber. I am unable to get a sworn statement in regard to the New York affair, but understand that it is well known to a number of clerks.

I knew nothing of this Railway Mail Service trouble until one day Mr. A. C. Walton called at this office and told me he had just returned from Washington, where he had had a conference with the honorable Postmaster General and yourself. He told me that an effort was being made by some of the clerks of the New England Division Railway Mail Association to unite their organization with the American Federation of Labor, and that a meeting was to be held March 12 in the rooms of the Federation in Boston. He stated he was not in sympathy with the movement, and knew the department was not. He also stated that he had been president of the organization for the past four years, and was a candidate for reelection, but that he did not care much to be elected, as he considered it a thankless job. He also stated that he would do all in his power to prevent an alliance with the American Federation of Labor, although it would hurt him as a candidate for reelection, for there were quite a number of the clerks that believed it would be beneficial to them as an organization to ally themselves with the Federation of Labor.

I wired you in cipher in regard to this meeting, and received two messages from you requesting me to do all in my power to ascertain who were the ringleaders, and obtain all the information possible in regard to the meeting.

On March 13 I wrote to you the results of the investigation. I was informed that Quackenbush and three other clerks met Frank H. McCarthy, general organizer of the Federation of Labor, at the hall of the latter organization, but that on account of the small attendance of clerks, the meeting was postponed until a later date. I am unable to obtain further information in regard to those meetings indicated in my first report.

I hand you herewith sworn statement, marked "Exhibit B," made by George A. Wood, national secretary of the Railway Mail Service Association of the United States. Mr. Wood attended both the February 12 and March 12 meetings of the New England Association in Boston. You will note that Mr. Wood considers Quackenbush a

disturber. I particularly call your attention to the following from Mr. Wood's sworn statement:

"Quackenbush announced publicly his conviction that a certain publication printed in Denver, Colo., called the Harpoon, was conducting an open and fearless fight for the railway postal clerks and that it should receive the support of all clerks."

Also permit me to call your attention to another portion of Mr. Wood's statement, which reads as follows:

"I especially noted his attitude of rebellion toward the laws and regulations of the Post Office Department."

Mr. Wood is one of the brainiest and biggest men in the railway mail organization in the United States, and his integrity and veracity are unquestioned.

I also hand you herewith a statement made by A. C. Walton, marked "Exhibit C," defining his position in regard to motives imputed to him in this matter.

I also call your attention to Exhibit D, which is an exact copy of the resolutions passed by the Railway Mail Clerks Association at their meeting in Boston February 12 last.

Permit me to call your attention also to Exhibit E, which is the sworn statement of Railway Postal Clerk Herbert F. Tebbetts, who was a member of the committee on resolutions at the meeting of March 12.

Exhibit F is the sworn statement of Clerk Herbert F. Tebbetts in regard to the meeting called for March 12 between the railway postal clerks and the Federation of Labor.

Exhibit G is a sample of the literature that is being circulated by the railway postal clerks at the present time in the interests of C. H. Quackenbush for president of the New England association.

Exhibit H is the sworn statement of A. C. Walton, president of the New England association, who presided at the regular meeting, March 12, and who received from the hands of Quackenbush the resolution written by the latter and which constitutes Exhibit A in my report of March 13. This paper was not returned to me from your office with the slip notifying the clerks of the meeting with the Federation of Labor, but I am satisfied that the hand that wrote the resolution referred to in Mr. Walton's statement also wrote the notice on the facing slip. I have submitted both of them to several of the inspectors, and they are of the same opinion.

On April 10 I will mail to you the sworn statement of Railway Postal Clerk Hoskins, of the Rutland & Boston railway post office, who witnessed the unwarranted assault upon Clerk Strong by Quackenbush. On the same date I will also mail to you the sworn statement of Railway Postal Clerk Tapley, of the Boston & Bangor railway post office, in reference to the personal assault which is said to have been made upon him by Quackenbush.

The more hot-headed railway postal clerks who are interested in the election of Quackenbush as president of the New England Association, although he has been removed from the service, are circulating a report that A. C. Walton, president of the association, has been traveling for some time on a post-office inspector's commission and has been appointed a post-office inspector. Yesterday assistant superintendent of the Railway Mail Service S. W. Shepardson, of this division, called at this office and asked me if Walton was traveling on a post-office inspector's commission. He stated he had heard that he

was from some of the clerks. Last night a clerk named Doherty, who is in the office of the superintendent of the Railway Mail Service here in Boston, asked Clerk Wescott of this office if Walton had been appointed an inspector, and told Wescott that a rumor was in circulation to that effect. This morning Charles Butler, a reporter on the Boston Journal, asked me if Walton had been appointed an inspector, and stated that he had heard from several that Walton was traveling on an inspector's commission.

It is evident to me that this rumor is being circulated by the friends of Quackenbush to influence the election of a president of the organization.

It is but proper for me to state here that Mr. Walton reported to me in regard to the proposed affiliation of some of the clerks with the Federation of Labor some time before Mr. Quackenbush had announced himself as a candidate for president. This would appear to set aside the charge that Walton is instituting this investigation against Quackenbush for the purpose of defeating a competing candidate.

In view of all these facts, I am firmly convinced that the action of the honorable Postmaster General in removing Quackenbush from the service was warranted, and I am convinced also that it will have a very beneficial effect upon the remaining clerks, who, believing themselves protected by their organization, took upon themselves the position of dictators and critics of the department and the honorable Postmaster General.

Very respectfully, LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

EXHIBIT A.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS,
County of Suffolk, ss:

I, Harry W. Strong, railway postal clerk, being first duly sworn, upon my oath depose and say that I have been employed as railway postal clerk on the line known as the Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway post office continuously for the past 20 years; that I am personally acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, railway postal clerk, and have known him for the past 10 or 12 years; that one evening three or four years ago—I am certain that this occurrence was more than three years ago—the said Quackenbush, Clerk Hoskins, of the Rutland and Boston railway post office, and myself were sitting at a table in the hallway in front of the dormitory in the post-office building at Boston, Mass., when the said Quackenbush and Hoskins were engaged in conversation relative to a small amount of money said to have been owing Quackenbush by Hoskins. In a spirit of jesting I said to Quackenbush, "Why don't you pay me that $2 you owe me?" To which Quackenbush replied, "I don't owe you any money," which was the fact. I then said to Quackenbush, "Never mind paying it. I was at your house three or four days and you can apply the amount on my board bill." Whereupon the said Quackenbush jumped up and struck me on the head with his fist several times and blackened my eye. As he did so he said, "That remark is an insult to my wife." I did not strike back, and was in no position to defend myself even had I desired to do so, as I was sitting down when he began the attack.

In justice to the said Quackenbush I hereby state that I do not blame him for attacking me, as I feel that he thought he was entirely justified. He had been drinking some at the time, but during the last four years he has not drank anything to amount to anything. I think at the time he attacked me he had had three or four mugs of sterling ale.

HARRY W. STRONG,
Railway Postal Clerk.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4th day of April, A. D. 1911, at Boston, Mass.

C. M. PERKINS,
Post-Office Inspector.

EXHIBIT B.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, *County of Rockingham, ss:*

I, George A. Wood, of Portsmouth, State and county aforesaid, being duly sworn, depose and say that I attended a meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association, on Sunday, February 12, 1911, in a hall on Tremont Street in Boston, Mass., and was at said meeting continuously from 2 p. m. until 10 p. m.; that A. C. Walton presided at said meeting; that I know Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a railway postal clerk, and that while I was at the above described meeting said Quackenbush was present and spoke upon many questions which arose for discussion; that I especially noticed his attitude of rebellion toward the laws and regulations of the Post Office Department; that the said Quackenbush spoke with great earnestness in favor of a certain resolution which resolution was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That we protest against the Executive order which prohibits freedom of speech on the part of Government employees; we assert as American citizens engaged in public service that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens; we demand the rescinding of the order."

That the said Quackenbush announced publicly his conviction that a certain publication printed at Denver, Colo., called the Harpoon, was conducting an open and fearless fight for the railway postal clerks, and that it should receive the support of all clerks.

I further declare that I attended another meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association, at the place above described on Sunday, March 12, 1911, and was present continuously between the hours of 4 p. m. and 9.30 p. m.; that the said Charles H. Quackenbush was also present at the last named meeting, and that he was in close consultation with Mr. Harry E. Slocum of Springfield, Mass.; that after many whispered conferences with the said Slocum, the said Quackenbush offered a certain resolution demanding that an investigation be made by the Post Office Department concerning the removal of a certain railway postal clerk from the Railway Mail Service; that the said Quackenbush subsequently withdrew the before-mentioned resolution and accepted as a substitute a resolution prepared by the said Slocum which was in the following form:

"Whereas one of our number has been removed from the service; and

"Whereas no charges were brought, no defense allowed, and an appeal is not granted; and

"Whereas said member claims he is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, members of the First Division Railway Mail Association, assembled in special meeting at Boston, this 12th day of March, 1911, do hereby protest against such action, and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought against him."

That it was understood that the clerk referred to in the last named resolution was the said Harry E. Slocum; that the said Quackenbush spoke in favor of the adoption of the resolution last quoted and urged its passage by the meeting.

I further declare that I was strongly impressed, in my observation of the behavior of the said Charles H. Quackenbush, with his evident lack of regard for the wishes and orders of his superior officers in the United States Railway Mail Service, and I believe his attitude as exhibited at the above meetings was such as to tend to spread discord and insubordination among the railway postal clerks present.

GEORGE A. WOOD.

Subscribed and sworn to April 5, 1911.
[SEAL.]

WALTER E. LOONEY,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT C.

[Personal.]

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS., *April 5, 1911.*

Mr. LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Post Office Inspector in Charge, Boston, Mass.

SIR: In a conversation with you to-day, it was evident to me that some methods are being used or action taken with the Post Office Department to show that my connection with your department in the case of Mr. C. H. Quackenbush was purely association politics. I will endeavor to show you briefly that this is not a fact.

It can not be denied that there is no honor to me in continuing in this office after having been president of the First Division Railway Mail Association for the past four years.

I allowed my name to be used again as a candidate for this office at the urgent requests of the many friends who had stood by me for years. They showed me it was a duty that I owed to the organization and the department when facing so much discontent among the men, and many hotheads were endeavoring to disrupt the organization, and, I can truthfully say, using various methods to have the members take up an affiliation with the Harpoon interests, brotherhood movement, and the American Federation of Labor.

Also, after my interview with the honorable Postmaster General, the honorable Second Assistant Postmaster General, and the honorable chief post-office inspector in January of this year, I was fully confirmed in my opinion that it was my duty to continue in this office if the members desired and render what humble assistance I could to the above-named gentlemen to suppress the radical element which was fast demoralizing the service.

I can further state, and I think you will bear me out in this statement, that in a conversation with you about the middle of February, as to this hotheaded movement in our service, and other matters pertaining to the business of the department, Mr. Quackenbush and the names of other clerks were used in our talk, and, at your request, I told you of certain acts that Mr. Quackenbush and others were reported as doing, but, at that time, not of a very serious nature. However, you suggested to me to keep in touch with such matters and report to you.

I mention this talk we had on or about the middle of February to prove to you that Mr. Quackenbush was in the limelight and his conduct spoken of by us long before he announced himself as a candidate in opposition to me for the presidency of the association in this division.

Yours, very truly, A. C. WALTON.

EXHIBIT D.

First Division Railway Mail Association, comprising the New England States.
A. C. Walton, president; H. R. Stoddard, secretary.
Following are the resolutions that were passed February 12, 1911:

Whereas we, the railway mail postal clerks of the first division Railway Mail Service, have reason to be dissatisfied with the conditions as at present existing, due to the recent ideas of economy, thereby imposing unbearable hardships on the clerks of this service and impairing their efficiency to the great detriment of the public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That an average of five hours' terminal, car, and road duty, or 100 miles, shall constitute a day's work for a railway postal clerk; that above hours be computed on a year of 289 working days.

Resolved, That we, being the only class of Government employees required to travel on Government business without receiving adequate traveling allowance, that we feel that our travel pay should be increased to at least $2 per day.

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert, as American citizens engaged in public service, that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens, and we demand the rescinding of this order.

Resolved, That all grievances arising between officials of the Post Office Department and railway postal clerks be submitted to our superior officers through a committee appointed by the clerks, and that in case no agreement is thereby reached said committee shall have the privilege of direct appeal to Congress.

Resolved, That to reestablish the former efficiency of the Railway Mail Service is of the highest importance to the public and can best be accomplished by the enforcement of these resolutions.

Resolved, That this meeting appoint a committee of 10 from the floor to draft such changes in the division constitution and the national constitution as will materially strengthen the association, as, owing to the present limitations, it has been ineffective; said committee to report at a special meeting to be called not later than March 10, 1911.

Resolved, That we believe that our national executive committee should engage a competent person, who is not a Government employee, to represent our interest at all times at Washington or elsewhere, and that the per capita tax be increased sufficiently to cover salary of same.

EXHIBIT E.

To whom it may concern:

I was present at a meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association held in Castle Hall, Tremont Street, Boston, Mass., February 12, 1911.

At that meeting I was one of a number of members appointed from the floor to draft a set of resolutions for that meeting.

In the meeting of this committee on resolutions when the resolution relating to the so-called "gag rule" came up for consideration much discussion arose as to the wording of this resolution. It was desired by the committee that this order should be rescinded, and it was proposed by Mr. Quackenbush to have the resolution read: "We demand that this order be rescinded." Myself and other members protested against the word "demand," and endeavored to have substituted the word "request."

Mr. Quackenbush said the order took from us our constitutional rights, and we were justified in demanding what rightfully belonged to us. He said the language was none too strong, and insisted that the word "demand" should remain in the resolution. The committee was polled, and after a majority had voted in favor of the resolution with the word "demand" in it, no further poll was taken.

HERBERT F. TEBBETTS,
Railway Postal Clerk,
Grove and Boston Railway Post Office.

Subscribed and sworn to at Boston, Mass., April 5, 1911, before me.

C. M. PERKINS,
Post Office Inspector.

EXHIBIT F.

To whom it may concern:

Having seen the printed notice of a meeting to be held in the Wells Memorial Building on Washington Street, Boston, Mass., March 12, 1911, and as such notice stated that the meeting was called for the purpose of interesting railway postal clerks to become affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and that all railway postal clerks would be welcome, I decided to attend.

The meeting was called at 4 p. m., but I did not arrive at the hall until nearly 5 p. m.

I met a reporter at the top of the stairs and was informed by him that the meeting had adjourned until after the meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association, which was being held in Castle Hall on Tremont Street at the same hour. He said Mr. Quackenbush and about a dozen other clerks had been there, but had only remained a few minutes and had gone over to the other meeting and were all coming back after the other meeting had closed.

HERBERT F. TEBBETTS,
Railway Postal Clerk, Grove and Boston Railway Post Office.

Subscribed and sworn to at Boston, Mass., April 5, 1911, before me,

C. M. PERKINS,
Post Office Inspector.

EXHIBIT G.

APRIL 3, 1911.

BROTHER: Mr. C. H. Quackenbush has been removed from the service, and inasmuch as his official record is perfect, he still being a member of the Railway Mail Association in good standing, is eligible for the office of president, and is still a candidate for that office, and it is your duty to him and to yourself to give him your support.

Brothers of the Railway Mail Association:

Owing to the deep interest which I take in the existence of our organization and the feeling which I have that each member should take an active interest in the present campaign, I wish to urge you to carefully consider the following observations on present conditions as I see them.

To begin with, I wish to call your attention to the many misleading statements in President Walton's circular of March 15. Quoting from same under heading "Exact copy of bill passed by Congress and approved March 4," I find this statement: "For travel allowance to railway postal clerks, $1,000,750; an annual vacation of 30 days with pay for all clerks who work 6 days or more a week."

As a matter of fact, $769,000 was the amount appropriated and 15 days the time allowed. The correct figures were easily accessible at least 10 days before the date of his letter. Now, why should Mr. Walton make use of these erroneous figures when the fact that they were questionable was well known to him.

His next statement is that a bill was passed giving the service more steel cars and improving conditions inside.

Now, while we all know that such a bill did pass the House, it was so mutilated in the Senate as to be positively weaker than the present law, and Senator Penrose in support of the Senate amendment claimed that this amendment was acceptable to President Canfield of the postal clerks organization: "Order modified in relation to taking up the slack."

Wherein can he claim that by any action of his he exerted any influence or assisted the association in any way in passing of resolutions or voicing the discontent which, when it finally succeeded in getting itself on record, together with similar actions in other divisions, procured the result he now claims as products of his effort, when it is well known that these meetings were called and the resolutions passed against his strenuous opposition. "When first elected division president I had the following in mind for betterment of our conditions—a just retirement for us."

This sounds reasonable and should have our approval; but, unfortunately, Mr. Walton is on record as having stated that he was not in favor of any form of retirement for civil-service employees, although his acceptance of the office of president of a retirement association shortly after making this statement might seem to prove otherwise.

He also states that in his judgment transfer service should be placed on a railway post-office plan and pay adjusted accordingly and also that he is of the opinion that our car space in full railway post office is not the proper system to adjust our salary upon.

It would seem from the above that Mr. Walton has failed to grasp the meaning of service promotion and in fact has never given sufficient thought to the subject to understand its application.

The next statement to which I would call your attention is that wherein he states that one of his pet ideas for years has been "we should have something or somebody to keep us posted and look after things with the department and other matters in general at Washington."

At the November meeting at the Quincy House a motion was made and carried that a committee be appointed to look into the cost of maintaining such a representative at Washington. Mr. Walton greeted the idea with a sneer and appointed a committee to consider it, which committee has never reported, and after the meeting made the remark that the idea was ridiculous and that it was impossible to get the present annual dues from the clerks, much less an amount sufficient to maintain such a representative. That due credit be given to those justly entitled to it, I will show you who is responsible for the suggestion (now so eagerly fathered by Mr. Walton) of a "publicity bureau," as I have shown the first time anything was seriously attempted along this line was at the November meeting at the Quincy House and was there referred to a committee, which did exactly what it was appointed to do—nothing. Matters then drifted along until the famous Canfield letter to Mr. Stewart was published. This letter is supposed to have been written by Messrs. Canfield, Roberts, Walton, and Wood, and stated we clerks would be satisfied with a minimum of five and a maximum of seven hours road duty. This incensed many, who thought that in making this reply, without any effort to ascertain the wishes of the men themselves, these gentlemen had greatly exceeded their authority. Letters expressing this feeling and requesting that a meeting be called were written to Mr. Walton, who replied that he would call a meeting soon. This reply satisfied his correspondents, and matters would probably have drifted on as before; but, unfortunately for the success of his do-nothing policy, he made the remark in the South Station one day that he did not intend to call a meeting and would not preside at one if it was called. Two men working independently at once got busy, and two sets of names were handed to the secretary demanding that a meeting be called. This is how we came to have the meeting of February 12, held in Castle Square Hall. At this, the best, most enthusiastic, and efficient meeting ever held in this division, all power was taken out of the hands of the president and all committees appointed, and all business transacted from the floor. The wisdom of this was immediately apparent, for we began to get results at once. A committee to draft suitable resolutions, of which Mr. Little was chairman, was appointed with instructions to report back to the meeting. After three hours' work this committee reported, recommending the resolutions substantially as adopted. This, then, is the first action taken by us as a body approving of this idea, and to this committee belongs the credit; but the idea was not in its present shape even then; there were still steps necessary to be taken. I will relate them: To accomplish this and

other desirable ends we must have a change in our constitution—to make this change effective this year it would be necessary that they be acted upon in their final shape at a meeting held not later than March 12. A committee was therefore appointed from the floor, instructed to consider these things and report; and it is to this committee, of which Mr. Little was also chairman, that all credit for the idea in its present shape must be given. Understand, please, that this committee was instructed to report to a meeting to be called not less than 30 days previous to the annual meeting of April 11. As the time when this committee must report drew near, Mr. Little, not believing that President Walton intended calling a meeting in time to consider, sent in 15 names requesting that a meeting be called. Mr. Walton's reply to this request was another request that Mr. Little would not insist on a meeting at this time. Mr. Little replied by sending in more names; and I want to tell you that it finally took two lists, amounting to 37 names, before this meeting was called to act on this committee's report on a matter which Mr. Walton would have us believe was "one of my pet ideas for years."

"I have had the courage of my convictions in my actions in presenting your affairs to any and all. I believe in a just, firm, and aggressive policy in handling our affairs in but a straightforward and gentlemanly manner."

Gentlemen, just consider how courageous, firm, and straightforward he has been.

After you and your meeting had passed a set of resolutions relative to the Slocum affair, and forced him to have them placed on record as unanimous, he, in the presence of a gentleman whose veracity you will not question, stated that he would tear them up.

He was asked by what authority or right he treated these resolutions in this manner when it voiced the sentiment of the association.

We have tried him, and he has certainly failed. If doing his best is a continuation of misrepresentations and permitting false impressions to exist between the division office, the department, and our association we most certainly can not afford to reelect him to the responsible office of president.

I am in the association now to be a worker, to lend my best efforts toward the upbuilding and improvement of the service and our conditions; I shall criticize the action of any officer as severely as I have that of Mr. A. C. Walton when the occasion warrants it.

What information the department gives out to our president is told for your benefit and satisfaction. Bear that in mind.

Let me urge you, gentlemen, to come out strong for Mr. Quackenbush, whom I consider a man of high moral standing, very efficient, with strong convictions for what is right and just in our cause, and who if elected will, after representing you at any conference, give you the exact results of that meeting.

We need a strong association with every member active and wide-awake. By electing Mr. Quackenbush, you will get rid of the discontent and uncertainty which now exists and we can take up the issues before us with concerted action.

If it has been possible for you to accomplish what you have as an association when each vital question has been against the opposition of your president, how much more can you accomplish by having a president who is in sympathy with your actions.

Sincerely and fraternally, yours,

DAVID F. HUNT,
Clerk in Charge, Boston, Providence, and New York.

EXHIBIT H.

To whom it may concern:

I was present at a meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association, held at Castle Hall, Boston, March 12, 1911, and acted as chairman of that meeting by virtue of the office which I held as president of the First Division Railway Mail Association. Mr. C. H. Quackenbush was present, and was seated a few feet from me at my left.

During the latter part of this meeting I observed Mr. Quackenbush writing on a piece of paper, and soon after he had finished writing he rose and offered it as a resolution (which resolution is now marked as "Exhibit A" in this case). I requested that he bring this resolution to my desk, and he did so.

This Exhibit A or resolution was written upon a sheet of paper, on the reverse side of which was a letter to Mr Quackenbush from some party written in ink, and, when folded, practically the same resolution was written on the opposite side by some other party with a lead pencil.

The above-described resolution, known now as Exhibit A, is the original resolution which was offered by Mr. Quackenbush at this meeting, and handed to Mr. Letherman by request, on March 13, 1911.

A. C. WALTON.

Subscribed and sworn to at Boston, Mass., April 5, 1911, before me.

C. M. PERKINS,
Post Office Inspector.

[Boston Traveler, April 11, 1911.]

MAIL CLERK WINS POINT IN FIGHT.

Charles H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., who last week was summarily dismissed from the Railway Mail Service, to-day secured, in the United States circuit court, an injunction restraining the officers and members of the New England division of the Railway Mail Association from interfering with his attendance or participation in a special meeting of the division held in this city to-day.

POLITICS INVOLVED.

The injunction petition was contested by Alvah C. Walton, of Jamaica Plain, president of the division, who was present with counsel. A sidelight on the situation was afforded by the fact that Quackenbush is a candidate for the presidency of the association, to which Walton hopes to be reelected. The ballot is now being taken by mail, and the belief entertained by those who have voted is that Quackenbush will receive a substantial majority. The result of the ballot is to be announced to-morrow.

Quackenbush's action was caused by a notice which he received yesterday from George A. Woods, national secretary of the Railway Mail Association, to the effect that, as his connection with the service had ended, his membership in the association had ceased. To-day he was notified that his membership in the New England division had been ended by the ruling of the national secretary.

Attorney Henry M. Chase, counsel for Quackenbush, argued that neither the national nor the subsidiary association had the right to drop a member without cause. He pointed out that the order of the Post Office Department dismissing Quackenbush mentioned no cause and that no charge against Quackenbush had been made. This was admitted by counsel for Walton, who acted for the New England division.

Judge Dodge, after issuing the injunction, said that he would give time to Walton to file an answer showing why the injunction should not be made permanent. Both then left the court room and started for the meeting.

Quackenbush said that he has insurance and sick-benefit rights in the division, acquired by the payment of assessments, and that he can not be legally deprived of them without a formal trial on charges.

[Boston American, April 11, 1911.]

GET INJUNCTION IN MAIL CLERK'S CASE.

Judge Dodge in the United States circuit court to-day issued an order restraining the First Division Railway Mail Association from preventing Charles H. Quackenbush running as a candidate against

A. C. Walton for the presidency of the organization. Quackenbush has been dropped as a Government employee in the Railway Mail Service, but remains in the fight for the head of the association. The meeting for the election of president and other officers takes place to-day at No. 446 Tremont Street. Counsel representing Quackenbush brought the matter before Judge Dodge.

[The Evening Times of April 12, 1911.]

NEW ENGLAND POSTAL CLERKS OPPOSE RULING.

BOSTON, *April 12, 1911.*

That a majority of the members of the New England division of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association are opposed to the Government order against secret organizations was shown to-day by the election of Charles H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, president of the division organization, and H. S. Slocum, of Springfield, delegates to the national convention.

Both men had been recently dropped from the service by the officials of the Post Office Department because they were active in getting members for the new Railway Mail Clerks' Union. Their election was construed as a rebuke to the attitude of the Postmaster General.

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 12, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP, *Chief Inspector,*
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As the result of the election for president of the New England Association of Railway Mail Clerks, ex-Clerk Quackenbush was elected president.

I am forwarding to you to-day under separate cover copies of Boston newspapers in reference to this matter.

Very respectfully,

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

[Boston Globe, April 12, 1911.]

BORDERS ON OPEN DEFIANCE—QUACKENBUSH ELECTED HEAD BY CLERKS—DISCHARGED FROM MAIL SERVICE—WALTON CHALLENGES VOTE—NATIONAL COMMITTEE SCORED IN RESOLUTION.

Under conditions bordering on open defiance of the United States Post Office Department, which on April 3 discharged Charles H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., from the Railway Mail Service, his late fellow employees yesterday elected him president of the New England division of the Railway Mail Association.

He defeated the administration candidate, who has served three previous terms, Alvah C. Walton, by a vote of 563 to 328. Later the members of the association voted to pay their new president a salary dating from the day on which he was discharged, and until he is either reinstated or cause is shown for his removal. The same provision was made for H. S. Slocum, who has also been discharged and who last evening was elected a delegate to the national convention of railway clerks to be held at Syracuse this summer.

The election was by mail ballot and had been in progress for about a week. Only yesterday morning Quackenbush had appeared in the United States court, asking for an injunction to prevent the officers of the association from interfering with his election, he having been declared by the executive committee not to be a member of the national association of railway mail clerks. A temporary injunction was issued and the case will be heard on its merits later.

RESULT GREETED WITH APPLAUSE.

The announcement of the election of Quackenbush was greeted with cheers and loud applause from all parts of the hall at 446 Tremont Street by the 300 members of the association present. President Walton, however, refused, under instructions from the executive committee of the national association, of which he is a member, to recognize the legality of the election of Mr. Quackenbush, declaring that he had been dropped from the membership and was not eligible to the presidency.

He finally accepted the report of the chairman of the committee on ballots, Carl Dent, on the presidency under protest. This announcement was greeted with jeers, catcalls, and laughter.

J. A. C. Brown, David Hunt, H. F. French, H. S. Slocum, and other friends of the newly elected president were on their feet immediately and offered resolutions affecting the case of Mr. Quackenbush.

Cries were heard from all parts of the room for Mr. Quackenbush to take the chair. Mr. Walton explained that this could not be so, since his opponent was not a member in good standing of the organization. He asked if the members of the association wanted him to resign the chair and several cried "Yes!" "Yes!" Mr. Walton denied having seen any injunction or any papers connected with such an order.

A copy of the injunction was then read for the benefit of the presiding officer by David Hunt, and M. E. Ferguson, of West Somerville, warned him that he would be liable for contempt of court if he left the chair refusing to recognize Mr. Quackenbush.

Mr. Walton took the ground that he had received no official notice of the injunction and continued to ignore his adversary. H. F. French claimed that the injunction restored the conditions of things to where they were before the letter was received from the executive committee of the national association. National Secretary George A. Woods said, in answer to a question asked by Mr. Walton, that he understood from the lawyers in the case that they had agreed on a continuation of the injunction.

MOTION TO ADJOURN KILLED.

Mr. Brennan moved an adjournment, saying he felt no results could be obtained in the manner in which things were being conducted, and they could reconvene with Mr. Quackenbush as presiding officer, thus getting around Mr. Walton, who had refused to surrender the chair, claiming that it was customary in the association to allow a retiring president the privilege of presiding throughout the final meeting of his term. Several of the younger men wanted the resolution rushed through, but others prevailed and the motion was killed.

James Doherty said that the presiding officer should answer several questions for him before he retired, and that if he were innocent he should receive a vindication and if he were guilty should be run out of the door. The demands for the retirement of Mr. Walton became so insistent that no further parliamentary procedure could be followed and the motion to accept the report of the committee on ballots and to induct the new president into office at once was carried through.

Mr. Walton challenged the vote and resigned in favor of Mr. Quackenbush. The latter refused to speak to his retiring predecessor and took up his stand on the other side of the hall. Several men asked explanations from Mr. Walton of statements which had been attributed to him, but he refused to answer them, saying that he was sick and would return later.

With the aid of M. D. O'Brien, who had previously been appointed acting secretary, the regular business of the meeting was again commenced after the newly installed president had made a few remarks, in which he thanked his friends for their loyal support of him, and promised to fight the matter to the bitter end, either until he wins or his case becomes a subject for a congressional investigation.

COLLECTION TAKEN UP.

A collection, from which $68 was realized was taken up and given to Mr. Quackenbush and Mr. Slocum for their immediate needs, and it was voted to circulate petitions asking members of the association to contribute to the support of the two men.

The following officers were also elected: F. H. Winkley, vice president; H. R. Stoddard, secretary; Fred Streck, H. F. French, C. H. McFarland, P. James Murphy, and John Brennan, executive committee. The delegates elected to the national convention at Syracuse were Edward James Ryan, H. S. Slocum, Lyman Hays, and George Nettleton. The following alternates as delegates were elected: F. A. Wilkie, F. A. Bailey, H. W. Kilcup, and W. N. Shaw.

The following resolution was adopted without debate:

Resolved, That we, the railway mail association of the first division, duly assembled, extend to our brother, Mr. C. H. Quackenbush, our sympathy and respect and promise of every possible aid in the effort which he is making to obtain a hearing on the causes of his removal from the service.

That we view with abhorrence the unbrotherly and unmanly act on the part of the national executive committee in supporting and in any way upholding the attempt to have it appear that this association does not and will not give to our brother, C. H. Quackenbush, our entire and hearty support, which attempt is all the more despicable in that Mr. Quackenbush at this time is engaged in an endeavor to overcome misrepresentation in Washington.

The proposition of instructing the delegates to the national convention to endeavor to have the insurance department of the organization transferred to the United States Railway Service Mutual Benefit Association, introduced by J. T. Barker, was laid on the table and will be discussed at the next meeting.

[Boston Daily Advertiser, April 12, 1911.]

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS ELECT QUACKENBUSH—NEW ENGLAND BRANCH MAKES HIM PRESIDENT—BY AID OF UNITED STATES COURT HE FOILED ATTEMPT TO SIDETRACK HIM BECAUSE OF RECENT DISMISSAL.

Charles H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., was elected president of the New England Railway Mail Association at its annual meeting held in Castle Square Hall, Tremont Street, yesterday.

Earlier in the day he appeared before Judge Dodge in the United States district court and was granted a temporary restraining order against Alvah C. Walton, president of the organization, and others, who sought to keep him from participating in the meeting.

He was escorted to the chair only after President Walton had refused for some time to surrender it.

Quackenbush was discharged from the Railway Mail Service a week ago by the Postmaster General for reasons never made known. Monday he received a notice from George A. Woods, national secretary of the Railway Mail Association, that he had been dropped from the membership of that organization.

Being dismissed from membership in the parent organization, Quackenbush was then looked upon as not being eligible to membership in the New England branch, and therefore could not participate in the meeting to-day.

Attorney G. K. Bartlett appeared for President Walton et al. and Henry M. Chase for Quackenbush.

Counsel for petitioner held that the national association had no right to drop a member in good standing. On the other hand, Attorney Bartlett contended that the parent organization had the right to drop a member, since he no longer was employed in the service of the Post Office Department.

Judge Dodge, after hearing arguments of counsel, granted the temporary restraining order so that Quackenbush could take part in the meeting yesterday. The respondents were given additional time to produce more definite authority for dropping Quackenbush from membership. The court will then take final action.

Friends and supporters of Quackenbush place the blame for all the trouble upon the shoulders of President Walton.

Quackenbush has said that he had insurance and sick benefit rights in the division, acquired by payment of assessments, and that he can not be legally deprived of them without formal trial on charges.

A heated discussion followed, after which the resolutions were temporarily withdrawn from discussion, as another motion was pending, but were unanimously passed later in the session.

Cheers greeted the reading of a telegram announcing that the city council of Stamford, Conn., adopted resolutions calling on the Connecticut Senators and Congressman Hill to have the Railway Mail Service investigated.

President Walton, who is a member of the executive committee of the national association, was asked how many of that committee had voted to drop Quackenbush and Slocum.

"Well," said Walton, "I voted to expel them for the good of the order." This was greeted with hoots, which ended when a recess was taken to count the ballots for division officers.

At yesterday's meeting a resolution extending to Quackenbush the division's sympathy, respect, and promise of aid in his effort to secure a hearing on the causes of his removal was introduced by H. E. Slocum, of Springfield, who was summarily dismissed from the service a month ago. The resolution also expressed abhorrence at the act of the national executive committee in supporting the attempt to make it appear that the association does not support Quackenbush. It declares it the more despicable because he is now trying to overcome misrepresentation at Washington.

After the ballots had been counted President Walton called the meeting to order and appointed M. D. O'Brien acting secretary, as the secretary had been called home on account of his wife's illness.

Carl Dent, chairman of the ballot committee, read the report of the vote for president, which was: Charles H. Quackenbush, 563 votes; President Walton, 328 votes.

Although President Walton at first ruled it out of order as unnecessary he finally put a motion accepting the committee's report.

Then it was suggested by several members that President Walton relinquish the chair to the newly elected president. This he refused to do on the ground that it was his duty to take the action because the newly elected president was ineligible to hold the office, as he was no longer a member of the organization.

Various motions were then made with a view to inducing President Walton to vacate the chair, but he refused to entertain any of them. Finally, the court's order restraining him from interfering with Charles H. Quackenbush's enjoyment of full privileges of membership in the organization was read, and it was plainly stated as the belief of several that in refusing to relinquish the chair he was making himself liable for contempt of court. After many protests he finally put a motion, which was carried unanimously, to the effect that he vacate the chair and the newly elected president be inducted into office.

President Walton then withdrew, declaring he did so under protest.

President Quackenbush then took the chair. He thanked the members for the honor conferred upon him, especially at this time when he had been removed from the Railway Mail Service and had such a fight on his hands.

A collection was taken up, which amounted to $68, and it was voted to appoint a man on every trunk line to collect funds to defray the expenses of President Quackenbush and H. E. Slocum, of Springfield, in making their fights for reinstatement in the service. It was also voted to assess every member $1 a month to pay President Quackenbush, Mr. Slocum, and any others that might be removed from the service under similar conditions salaries equivalent to the salaries they received in the service.

The other officers were reelected and delegates and alternates were elected to the national convention and amendments to the constitution were adopted.

[The Boston Traveler, Tuesday, April 11, 1911.]

MAIL CLERK WINS POINT IN FIGHT.

Charles H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., who last week was summarily dismissed from the Railway Mail Service, to-day secured in the United States circuit court an injunction restraining the officers and members of the New England division of the Railway Mail Association from interfering with his attendance or participation in a special meeting of the division held in this city to-day.

There was a scene close to a riot at the meeting, in which friends of Quackenbush expressed their dissatisfaction with Walton's course as an officer.

The injunction petition was contested by Alvah C. Walton, of Jamaica Plain, president of the division, who was present with counsel. A sidelight on the situation was afforded by the fact that Quackenbush is a candidate for the presidency of the association, to which Walton hopes to be reelected. The ballot is now being taken by mail, and the belief entertained by those who have voted is that Quackenbush will receive a substantial majority. The result of the ballot is to be announced to-morrow.

Quackenbush's action was caused by a notice which he received yesterday from George A. Woods, national secretary of the Railway Mail Association, to the effect that as his connection with the service had ended his membership in the association had ceased. To-day he was notified that his membership in the New England division had been ended by the ruling of the national secretary.

Attorney Henry M. Chase, counsel for Quackenbush, argued that neither the national nor the subsidiary association had the right to drop a member without cause. He pointed out that the order of the Post Office Department dismissing Quackenbush mentioned no cause and that no charge against Quackenbush had been made. This was admitted by counsel for Walton, who acted for the New England division.

Judge Dodge, after issuing the injunction, said that he would give time to Walton to file an answer showing why the injunction should not be made permanent. Both then left the court room and started for the meeting.

Quackenbush said that he has insurance and sick benefit rights in the division, acquired by the payment of assessments, and that he can not be legally deprived of them without a formal trial on charges.

The meeting which followed the proceedings in the court room was marked by tumult and expressions of disapproval of the official acts of President Walton.

Resolutions extending sympathy and promising aid to Mr. Quackenbush and censuring Mr. Walton, offered by H. E. Slocum, of Springfield, who was summarily dismissed from the service a month ago, caused a heated debate, when somebody recalled that there was another motion pending, and the resolutions were temporarily withdrawn.

Then one clerk asked President Walton, who is a member of the executive committee of the national association, how many members of that committee had voted to drop Quackenbush and Slocum from the membership roll.

"How did you vote?" came the question from more than half of the 300 clerks present.

"Well," said Mr. Walton, "I will tell you; I voted to expel both of them, for the good of the order."

There was a storm of hooting, which was quelled only when one clerk demanded that the count of the ballots for division officers be taken up at once.

The count, which looked as if it would occupy at least three hours. was then begun.

There was a storm of cheers when a telegram was read announcing that the city council of Stamford, Conn., last night adopted resolutions calling upon the Connecticut Senators and Congressman Hill to have the Railway Mail Service investigated.

[The Boston Journal, April 12, 1911.]

QUACKENBUSH WINS RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS' PRESIDENCY—DEFEATS WALTON IN STORMY MEETING JARRED BY PROTESTS.

One of the most sensational meetings ever held by the New England railway mail clerks occurred yesterday afternoon at Castle Square Hall on Tremont Street, when President Alvah C. Walton tried to prevent President-elect Charles H. Quackenbush from taking the chair.

Throughout the meeting, which began at 1 o'clock, nothing but hisses, catcalls, and jeers greeted President Walton.

Never in the history of the organization was there such a scene as was witnessed at the meeting.

Earlier in the day Mr. Quackenbush was granted an injunction by Judge Dodge, of the United States Court, preventing Mr. Walton from interfering with the election.

DISCHARGED FROM SERVICE.

Mr. Quackenbush was on April 8 discharged from the service by Postmaster General Hitchcock, charged with violating the rules of the department. Since that time Mr. Quackenbush has been suspended from the association.

Yesterday over 1,000 members of the association packed the hall. Explaining to the members why he did not recognize Mr. Quackenbush as president, Mr. Walton stated Quackenbush was not a member of the association, and was, therefore, not eligible for office in it.

Mr. Walton also protested against the election of H. E. Slocum as one of the delegates to the clerks' convention, which is to be held in New York. President Walton's reason for protesting against the election of Slocum was that he also was not a member of the association, he alleged.

The gathering seemed to be in favor of Mr. Quackenbush, and it was not until several of the members threatened to call the police that President Walton vacated the chair in favor of him.

In order that he may fight his battle and be reinstated a member, Mr. Quackenbush was granted an assessment of $1 per member by a rising vote of those present.

Mr. Brennan condemned President Walton for his action during the meeting. Mr. Brennan was supported by M. D. Ferguson and several others.

QUACKENBUSH HAS BIG VOTE.

The total number of ballots cast for president was 917, and of this number Mr. Quackenbush received 563. Walton received 328.

F. H. Winkley was elected vice president and H. R. Stoddard secretary and treasurer. Others elected were: H. F. French, C. H. McFarland, F. C. Streck, and P. James Murphy, members of the executive committee; G. A. Nettleton, H. E. Slocum, E. J. Ryan, and S. Lyman Hayes, delegates to the convention.

In case the court forbids Mr. Slocum serving as a delegate, the following alternates were chosen: F. A. Wilkie, F. A. Bailey, Harry S. Kilcup, W. N. Shaw, and J. J. Murphy.

[Boston Evening Record, Tuesday, April 11, 1911.]

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS IN BIG FIGHT—QUACKENBUSH TAKES PART—BY ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES COURT.

Charles H. Quackenbush, candidate for president of the New England Railway Mail Association, which held its annual election to-day in Castle Square Hall, Tremont Street, appeared before Judge Dodge in the United States district court and was granted a temporary restraining order against Alvah C. Walton, president of the organization, and others, who sought to keep him from participating in a meeting in connection with the balloting.

Quackenbush was discharged from the Railway Mail Service a week ago by the Postmaster General for reasons never made known. Yesterday he received notice from George A. Woods, national secretary of the Railway Mail Association, that he had been dropped from the membership of that organization.

Being dismissed from membership in the parent organization Quackenbush was then looked upon as not being eligible to membership in the New England branch, and therefore could not participate in the meeting to-day.

Attorney G. K. Bartlett appeared for President Walton et al. and Henry M. Chase for Quackenbush.

NO RIGHT TO DROP HIM.

Counsel for the petitioner held that the national association had no right to drop a member in good standing. On the other hand, Attorney Bartlett contended that the parent organization had the right to drop a member since he no longer was employed in the service of the Post Office Department.

Judge Dodge, after hearing arguments of counsel, granted the temporary restraining order so that Quackenbush could take part in the meeting to-day. The respondents were given additional time to produce more definite authority for dropping Quackenbush from membership. The court will then take final action.

The most recent action of the national association has caused indignation among the railway mail clerks in New England, who are sticking to Quackenbush to a man. It is forecasted that after the ballots have been counted this afternoon he will be the next president of the New England organization.

Friends and supporters of Quackenbush place the blame for all the trouble upon the shoulders of President Walton.

[New Haven Evening Register, Monday, April 10, 1911.]

QUACKENBUSH FIRED BY MAIL ASSOCIATION—INSURGENT CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENCY GETS NOTICE OF REMOVAL FROM NATIONAL ASSOCIATION—LAST MOVE BY REGULARS BEFORE BALLOTS ARE COUNTED—HAS ALREADY BEEN FIRED BY GOVERNMENT.

There is going to be the hottest kind of fight to-morrow night up in Boston when the ballots are counted for the presidency of the New England branch of the Railway Mail Service Association, composed of the railway mail clerks.

The latest development in the fight for the presidency came this morning, when C. H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, who is the "insurgent" candidate for president, received a letter in substance as follows:

PORTSMOUTH, N. H., *April 8, 1911.*

Mr. C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
Stamford, Conn.

DEAR SIR: Under instructions from the executive committee of the railway mail association, I am directed to advise you that your membership in the said association has been canceled this day.

I beg to offer to return to you upon demand any advance assessments which you may have paid that have not been levied at this time. Kindly return certificate n the inclosed envelope.

GEORGE A. WOODS,
Secretary of the National Association.

This is the latest move in the campaign of the regulars for the retention of their candidate A. C. Walton, of Jamaica Plains, in office. Walton, the present incumbent of the office, is the candidate of the regular and national association, with whose ruling the insurgent branch of the New England wing has long been dissatisfied.

Some time ago the boom for Quackenbush, who is a red-hot insurgent, started, and soon after things began to happen.

Only about two months ago they culminated in the notice from Washington of the removal of Quackenbush from the railway service. News of this was received with great glee by the Harpoon, a paper published in Denver and which delights to bang the postal service at Washington and has sided with the insurgents in their every effort to ameliorate conditions.

FAIR PLAY.

To the members of the First Division Railway Mail Association:

It is an old saying that "everything is fair in love and war," and to judge the methods that are being used at the present time to defeat President Walton from being reelected the politics of the first division must be classed with "love and war," with accent on the war.

A few days ago Mr. David F. Hunt issued a circular, which has been widely distributed throughout the division, charging Mr. Walton with having made many misleading statements in his circular of March 15. He claims that Mr. Walton's statement regarding the amount appropriated for travel pay and about the number of days vacation granted to clerks who work six days or more a week is wrong. Having seen the bill as printed and approved, I claim Mr. Walton's statement is true; that the amount for travel allowance for railway postal clerks is $1,000,750 and that clerks who work six days or more a week shall be granted 30 days annual vacation with pay. This is the law as printed, and while it became a law through an error of the engrossing clerk, and we may be deprived of its benefits for the next year by a ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury, I feel sure that when the matter is brought up for consideration next year it will be impossible to have either of these clauses repealed for the reason that any one of our many friends in Congress can make a point of order against changing existing law, and if it remains in the bill no doubt the necessary money will be appropriated to carry it into effect.

"Order modified in relation to taking up the slack."

Mr. Hunt asks:

Wherein can Mr. Walton claim that by any action of his he exerted any influence or assisted the association in any way in passing of resolutions or voicing the discontent, which, when it finally succeeded in getting itself on record together with similar actions in other divisions procured the result he now claims as products of his efforts, when it was well known that these meetings were called and the resolutions were passed against his strenuous opposition?

Herein is where Mr. Hunt is misleading you to believe that the meeting we had in this division February 12 and the resolutions passed at that meeting were effective in procuring a modification of the order to take up the slack. This shows that Mr. Hunt is not familiar with the action taken by the executive committee of the Railway Mail Association at Cleveland, Ohio, February 6, with the result that they were granted a conference with the Second Assistant Postmaster General on February 9 and the order was modified on that date. This was three days before the meeting held in Boston.

Possibly Mr. Hunt was not a member of the Railway Mail Association at the time, and if not he, of course, would not have received the February number of the Railway Post Office, wherein there was a full account of the meeting of the executive committee.

Mr. Hunt charges Mr. Walton with not being in favor of a retirement measure. I have been present with Mr. Walton when he has talked for more than an hour with a Member of Congress on the matter of retirement for railway postal clerks, and while I have not conferred with him about this matter, I am positive that he has done and will do as much for any retirement measure that will be acceptable to the clerks as any man can possibly do.

Mr. Hunt further criticizes Mr. Walton for his statement that in his judgment transfer service should be placed on a railway post office plan and pay adjusted accordingly, and also that he is of the opinion that our car space in full railway post office is not the proper system to adjust our salary upon.

He says that Mr. Walton has failed to grasp the meaning of service promotion and has never given the matter sufficient thought to understand it.

In answer to this I will say that it has taken us quite a few years to get travel allowance, and no doubt it will take five or more years to

get service promotion. In the meantime there is nothing to prevent the department from doing what Mr. Walton suggests in regard to the transfer service, as it requires no change in existing law. And again, if we should get a service promotion that would not provide for giving a clerk in charge of an apartment-car line the same salary as the clerk in charge on a regularly authorized full railway post office. I have in mind instances like the Twentieth Century train on the Boston & Albany, where the pay of the clerk in charge should be the same as on the other single full railway post-office cars on the line.

Mr. Hunt states that what information the department gives out to our president is told for your benefit and satisfaction and that if Mr. Quackenbush is elected he will, after representing us at any conference, give us the exact results of that meeting.

Here is where Mr. Hunt again shows himself to be unfamiliar with the conditions which are imposed upon every man who is granted a conference with a representative of the department. There are other statements in Mr. Hunt's circular that are misleading and partly untrue.

I have not the time to answer all his charges, but assure you that what I have written is facts and not conditions as I see them through smoked glass.

Mr. Hunt urges you to come out strong for Mr. Quackenbush and to defeat Mr. Walton. The present conditions of unrest among the postal clerks all over the country and the desire to do something radical threatens to make the coming convention at Syracuse a fight to prevent the radicals from disrupting our association, and we need more than ever before the best leaders to represent us.

Mr. Quackenbush is an unknown quantity.

Mr. Walton has served us for four years and has accomplished more for us, and not only us, but for the clerks all over the country, than any other man we can elect to succeed him. He has been energetic and aggressive, and his accomplishments far overshadow any mistakes he may have made.

The only thing I might say that would be detrimental to Mr. Quackenbush's cause is that his managers are eleventh-hour converts to the cause and have not been members of the Railway Mail Association long enough to know what has been done or who has accomplished it. A man does not have to look far to see that they have an axe to grind. Now, gentlemen, I have written this circular, not because I am a candidate for delegate, for I am not looking for votes and do not expect to have enough to be classed with the also ran, but because I know that Mr. Walton is being lied about and I myself have been lied about in this campaign. I have always been friendly with Mr. Hunt and simply say that as far as he is concerned he has been misinformed in regard to some of the subjects he has covered in his circular.

But there are other men in the division who are circulating false and defamatory stories about myself and also about Mr. Walton.

Now, to those of you who have not voted, be sure and weigh all the arguments for and against Mr. Walton before you decide to turn down a man who has devoted so much time unselfishly for your interests.

In closing I will state that I have prepared this circular of my own free will and accord and at my own expense. No man has advised

me to even send out a circular. I do not know whether Mr. Walton will approve my action or not, neither do I care. Right is right.

H. F. TEBBETTS,
Clerk in Charge, Groveton and Boston.

To the members of the First Division Railway Mail Association:

No doubt you have received a notice from President Quackenbush calling for an emergency assessment of $1 to be paid on or before May 20; what do you intend to do about it? I for one shall refuse to pay it.

To those of you who may not be informed as to the reason for this attempt to raise over $1,000, I will refer you to the following resolution, which is prima facie evidence showing what the money is to be collected for:

[Copy of motion passed at the annual meeting, April 11, 1911.]

That this association pay to Harry E. Slocum and Charles H. Quackenbush, and to any other clerk or clerks who may be similarly removed, the amount of their salaries from the date of their removal.

That these payments shall be continued until such time as said clerks shall be reinstated, or until definite charges shall be made and proven against them, which warrant their removal, or until otherwise ordered by the association: *Provided*, That an emergency assessment of $1 on each member shall be at once levied, and similar future assessments as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Motion carried.

You will note that the above resolution states that similar future assessments shall be levied as may be necessary.

There is no limit to the number or the frequency that they may be levied.

I have been a member of the beneficiary department since its incorporation, being one of the 200 charter members who had to pay in $10 each in order to get a charter.

For the first few years of its existence I gave freely of my time and money in an endeavor to get members and place our insurance on a sound basis. I have always worked earnestly and tirelessly for the Railway Mail Association, and no man can accuse me of being a "tight-wad;" but when any man or set of men attempt to force me to give money to a cause which I feel is detrimental to the interests of the Railway Mail Association, I absolutely refuse.

H. F. TEBBETTS,
Groveton and Boston Railway Post Office.

APRIL 13, 1911.

SIR: I have not received as yet the additional affidavits regarding former Railway Postal Clerk Quackenbush, it being alleged that he recently engaged in another fight. I wish you would kindly let this data come forward at an early date, together with any other information which you have acquired regarding the conduct of Quackenbush.

Please do not neglect to take care of this matter to the fullest extent.

Respectfully,

_____,
Chief Inspector.

THE INSPECTOR IN CHARGE,
Boston, Mass.

[Memorandum for Mr. Weed.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 13, 1911.

I hand you herewith an additional affidavit covering the action of former Railway Postal Clerk Quackenbush in striking a postal clerk without provocation. Please place this with the other papers on the same subject.

R. S. SHARP, *Chief Inspector.*

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, *County of Suffolk, ss:*

I, John H. Hoskison, railway postal clerk, being first duly sworn, upon my oath depose and say that I have been employed as a railway postal clerk on the line known as the Alburg and Boston railway post office continuously for the past six years.

That I am personally acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, railway postal clerk, and have known him for the past five or six years.

One evening, three or four years ago (I am not certain of the exact date), the said Quackenbush, Clerk Harry W. Strong, and myself were sitting at a table in the hallway in front of the dormitory in the post-office building at Boston, Mass., engaged in conversation. Besides the clerks mentioned, there were other clerks, but I can not recall at the present time who they were. I do not remember what the conversation was about, but we were all jesting with one another, when, all of a sudden, said Quackenbush jumped up from the table and struck said Harry W. Strong, railway postal clerk, and blacked his eye. I was very much surprised at the time, because the conversation we were engaged in was simply jesting, and I saw no occasion for a demonstration of this kind.

As the said Quackenbush jumped up to strike said Strong, it was so sudden that he tipped my chair over and I fell on the floor. However, I was not injured in the fracas.

At the time I did not consider that said Quackenbush was justified in making the attack on the said Strong, and I told him so at the time.

JOHN H. HOSKISON,
Railway Postal Clerk.

Subscribed and sworn to at Boston, Mass., this 10th day of April, A. D. 1911.

C. M. PERKINS,
Post Office Inspector.

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 12, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I hand you herewith affidavits made by Railway Postal Clerks Louis F. Tapley and John H. Hoskison. The affidavit of

Tapley amounts to but little, and Hoskison's affidavit simply corroborates the sworn statement of Clerk Strong in regard to the assault made upon him by Railway Postal Clerk Quackenbush.

Very respectfully,

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 10, 1911.

Mr. LAWRENCE LETHERMAN, *Inspector in Charge,*
Care of Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LETHERMAN: I inclose herewith affidavits of Louis F. Tapley and John H. Hoskison, railway postal clerks, which you instructed me to get.

I also inclose a circular letter which was given to me by Clerk Hoskison, and which is being sent to all railway mail clerks by Senator La Follette. This for your information.

Very respectfully,

C. M. PERKINS,
Acting Inspector in Charge.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, *County of Suffolk, ss:*

I, Louis F. Tapley, railway postal clerk, being first duly sworn, upon my oath depose and say, that I am personally acquainted with Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush, having known him for several years past; that the relations existing between myself and the said Quackenbush have always been friendly and are friendly at the present time; that I have never had an altercation with him at any time more than an argument; that I do not recall ever having had any unfriendly feeling toward him, nor have I ever had any serious argument with him; that I can not say of my own knowledge whether the said Quackenbush is quick tempered or hot-headed; that he never exhibited such tendencies in my presence; that I have in the past had arguments with him, the subject matter of which I do not now recall; that several years ago, perhaps five or six years ago, I had an argument with him, the subject of which may have been about the Civil War; that on this occasion which I have in mind, both the said Quackenbush and myself became somewhat temporarily angry in the heat of argument, but after the argument was over we shook hands and remained good friends; that the argument hereinbefore referred to was the only argument which we ever had; that I have never harbored any ill-feeling toward the said Quackenbush and he never evidenced any hard feelings toward me; that I do not recall anything that either he or I said in the argument hereinbefore referred to except that I do remember that I made the statement to him that his father was a slaveholder; that I do not remember anything more that either he or I said; that the argument was in the

dormitory in the post-office building at Boston, Mass.; that there may have been other clerks present, but I can not recall a single one.

LOUIS F. TAPLEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8th day of April, A. D. 1911, at Boston, Mass.

C. M. PERKINS,
Post Office Inspector.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON CENSUS,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1911.

MY DEAR SIR: My attention has been directed to a letter of instructions issued by Second Assistant Postmaster General Stewart to division superintendents to the effect that it is "inimical to the interests of the Government" for clerks to organize, and "that it is incompatible with their obligation to the department" for them to assume another obligation.

I am also informed that division superintendents and clerks in charge, in carrying out instructions, were directed "not to publish this * * * order, but let it go out by word of mouth," and upon receipt of this letter, ordered railway mail clerks to call at the office, and informed them "that the department disapproves of organizations among railway postal clerks."

This statement was supplemented by a question, in substance as follows:

Knowing this, will you continue active in the federation movement?

I am advised that the clerks were given to understand that their continuation in the service depended upon the answer.

It is further represented to me that this system of intimidation has been, and is being, carried on to such an extent that clerks have been prevented from exercising their right to join a union.

I desire to secure direct statements from railway mail clerks as to whether, in any way, they have been so threatened or intimidated. If you have been approached and an effort made to prevent you from joining or to force you to withdraw from a union or to cease your activities as a union man, state fully the circumstances, and be particular to state the date and place where such effort was made and the name or names of any officer or officers who made such effort or were present when you were thus interviewed.

The railway mail clerks have the right to organize. If the officers of the department are endeavoring to prevent them from so doing by threats of discharge, such action is without legal authority or moral right. If I find conditions in the railway postal service to be generally such as has been represented, I shall introduce and do everything in my power to pass a bill to prevent the continuation of such un-American practices and to preserve to all Government employees the right of petition which belongs to every citizen, and the right to form or join organizations for the improvement of their labor conditions.

During January and February there was general complaint because certain changes in the regulations imposed added burdens upon the railway mail clerks. A conference between representatives of the railway postal clerks and the Post Office Department officials was subsequently held, at which it was claimed an understanding was reached that certain changes would be made which would adjust the grievances of the clerks. I am desirous to obtain information as to the effect of these changes and to know if they have resulted in removing the causes of complaint.

Inclosed is a blank, submitting questions to which I would be pleased to have you make reply. Your answer will be held confidential, except as to the facts stated, as it is my purpose merely to collect the information and present it to Congress without disclosing the names or any circumstances which would lead to the identity of my informants.

Trusting to receive a prompt reply, I am,

Very truly, yours,

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE.

[Fill out this blank and mail to Robert M. La Follette, Box 40, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.]

1. Have you been informed directly or indirectly by your superiors that the Post Office Department or its officials disapprove of your joining a union of railway mail clerks? .....

2. Has the statement been made, or, has it been intimated in any way to you, by anyone in authority over you, that if you join a union of clerks, there was danger or a likelihood that it would result in your dismissal from the service? If so, state circumstances fully .....

3. Have you been officially notified or have you been advised or informed by any officer of the Post Office Department, directly or indirectly, that if you "did not cease your activities in the Federation" that you would lose your position as a railway mail clerk? If so, state circumstances .....

4. State the run upon which you were employed and the hours you worked prior to the enforcement of the "Take up the slack" order ..... (*a*) In stations ..... (*b*) On cars ..... (*c*) Time off at end of run ..... (*d*) Time for study .....

5. What changes did the "Take up the slack" order make? .....

6. Did the conference between representatives of railway mail clerks and department officials, held early in February, work any change? If so, state fully, giving the hours you are required to work ..... (*a*) In stations ..... (*b*) On the road ..... (*c*) Time off at end of run ..... (*d*) Time for study .....

7. If changes have been made to meet the complaints of the clerks, have such changes operated to relieve the cause of the complaints? If not, state in what particulars there is cause for complaint at the present time .....

8. Did changes result in delay of mails, carrying unworked mail by stations or through to the end of run? Give instances of such delays which you recall .....

9. Postal Division Number .....

[The Evening Herald, Friday, Apr. 14, 1911.]

MAIL CLERK MAKES PLEA TO HITCHCOCK—QUACKENBUSH SAYS HIS ELECTION WAS NOT MEANT AS AN ACT OF DEFIANCE.

STAMFORD, CONN., *April 14, 1911.*

Charles H. Quackenbush, who was dropped from the service the day before he was elected president of the New England division of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association, has appealed to Postmaster General Hitchcock.

He explains also that his election was not in defiance of the post-office authorities, inasmuch as his candidacy was announced March 4.

Before his dismissal, he says, 500 votes had been already cast.

APRIL 15, 1911.

Mr. C. H. QUACKENBUSH, *Stamford, Conn.*

SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of the letter you addressed to the Postmaster General under date of the 5th instant with reference to your removal from the position of railway postal clerk.

Respectfully,

T. L. WEED, *Chief Clerk.*

STAMFORD, CONN., *April 5, 1911.*

Hon. F. H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I received on yesterday morning an order removing me from the Railway Mail Service for "conduct detrimental to the welfare of the service."

Since the receipt of this communication I have given my conduct personally and as a clerk very careful examination and fail to find anything therein that would justify my removal.

I have always been proud of my record and reputation as a clerk, and sincerely believe that there must have been some misunderstanding due to misrepresentation which caused my removal, and earnestly beg of you that you grant me a hearing.

Very respectfully,

C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

STAMFORD, CONN., *April 14, 1911.*

EDW. J. RYAN,
Superintendent Railway Mail Service, Boston, Mass.

SIR: Relying on years of acceptable service and conduct, I hereby respectfully request reinstatement in the Railway Mail Service.

Very truly, yours,

C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 17, 1911.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.:

Forwarded for consideration, and Mr. Quackenbush so advised.

EDW. J. RYAN,
Superintendent.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Replying to your letter of April 13, in reference to affidavits regarding former Railway Postal Clerk Quackenbush which I spoke to you about while I was in Washington, I beg to inform you that on the day after my return to Boston they were returned to me from Washington, and I immediately forwarded them to you. I presume you have them by this time.

I shall attempt to secure some further information in regard to the Quackenbush matter as soon as possible.

Very respectfully,

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., April 21, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to hand you herewith further papers bearing upon the Quackenbush matter. I call your attention particularly to Quackenbush's appeal to the railway mail clerks for money to support him while making a fight to be reinstated. I have marked this appeal "Exhibit A."

The other matter which I refer herewith I think you will find of an interesting character, particularly the letter written by H. E. Slocum, February 14 last, to "Tommy."

Very respectfully,

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

EXHIBIT A.

In accordance with the motion passed at the annual meeting I am instructed to give every clerk in the division an opportunity to subscribe to a fund for immediate expenses, in connection with my endeavor to obtain a hearing from the department and also to reimburse me for expenses incurred in proceedings necessary to protect my rights as a member of the association.

Any money that your crew desires to give may be sent to me direct.

Fraternally, yours,

C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
President First Division, Railway Mail Association, Stamford, Conn.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
February 9, 1911.

MY DEAR "TOMMY": I have decided to run for delegate to convention at Syracuse, N. Y., and shall announce my platform in the February Railway Post Office—that is, if George A. Wood will publish it.

I trust that after reading my announcement you will feel like supporting me, for I admit that a candidate without your support has about as much chance of election as a clerk has of buying a meal for the large(?) amount recommended by Hitchcock.

Thank you for those rations you send to 293, but please explain how you have so much left after paying but that 6 cents for a meal.

Possibly G. A. Wood won't publish my platform, as I came out against him, but if he refuses I will publish it in the March Harpoon.

Are you going to that meeting in Boston Sunday, February 12? There will be something doing or I lose my guess.

I have been writing a long time and am tired so will stop, hoping to hear from you soon.

I am sincerely, yours,

H. E. SLOCUM,
Railway Postal Clerk,
19 Ringgold Street, Springfield, Mass.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., *February 14, 1911.*

DEAR TOMMY: Yours of the 12th received, and I hasten to tell you that I got lots of pleasure out of reading it, but I am afraid you are not aware that the clerks of to-day are not the same as they were a year or two ago; by this I mean that they are fully awake and aroused and will not stand for any more kicks. I admit that there are some who will not dare protest and who will not support any progressive movement; still, I believe that there are a great many who will not stand for any more of this "bow down and beg attitude" by our organization.

Am confident that if you had attended the meeting at Boston last Sunday that you would have seen a body of 300 men acting as a unit in demanding their rights, and I think the resolutions adopted by them show that they have stood for all the fooling they intend to.

That meeting was the largest and best one ever held in New England—something doing every minute. Why, Tom, there were five or six on their feet nearly all the time waiting for their turn to speak, and I assure you that those "old woodchoppers" from Maine did their part and voted with the rest for any and all radical action, even to extending a vote of thanks to the Harpoon.

One man said after meeting, "It was worth $40 a minute" to see those white-haired vets demanding their rights; and it certainly was. I note what you say in regard to putting teeth into our present organization or else form a new one with knives in it.

Do you think it good policy to form a new organization without first trying to reform the present one?

As you probably know, a committee of 10 was appointed by the floor to decide on such amendments to our constitution as will curb the power of the executive committee—in other words, it means that in future the clerks will run the organization and not the executive committee.

Have no fear about the paper, for after the next convention it will be run by an outsider who will not have a "big stick" held over his head by the executive committee.

Of course, you know that George A. Ward has resigned as editor, and I understand that "Kidwell" has been appointed in his place, but it will mean a fight at Syracuse to take away the unlimited power which the executive committee now enjoys (?), but I do not see why a delegate that fights for these things should carry his resignation with him.

I do not think Hitchcock or any of his "hall-room boys" would dare fire a clerk for asking for his rights, and I do not see why those officials should tell us how we should run our association or what we shall print in our official paper.

I wish you would write and tell me some of those wholesale changes in our constitution that are necessary to bring our association in touch with all the boys.

If you will do so, I will gladly bring them to the committee that was named to recommend just such changes. Any changes you suggest I assure you will not be too radical and will be duly considered.

Phil Little is chairman, and he certainly showed his fighting spirit last Sunday when he defied Walton to rule him out of order.

Walton didn't dare and it is a good thing he didn't for he surely would have "got his" from the floor.

Now, Tommy, I don't intend to resign just now and if elected as delegate I assure you I shall fight for our rights and they won't scare me by citing "gag orders."

I have defied them for six months and they don't dare fire me or any one else at the present time.

The "gag" has got to go from the Post Office Department and also our organization, and now is the time to remove it.

If our demands are not granted we shall have to do as those clerks did in the Northwest and I feel sure that if those measures are necessary that a big majority will vote in favor of it.

I have been given to understand that Walton and the rest of the Railway Mail Association machine intends to fight my candidacy for delegate, so suppose they will circulate lies about me, but I shall appeal to the clerks the very first time that I hear any of these lies.

I wouldn't be surprised if they (the machine) appealed to the department, but I defy them to do anything to me, for if they do it will be a sorry day for them, and don't you forget it.

Well, Tommy, I think I have aired my views enough for this time so I will stop. Hoping to hear from you again soon, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

H. E. Slocum.

April 21, 1911.

Dear Sir: With reference to the letter you addressed to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, under date of the 6th instant, I beg to advise you that C. H. Quackenbush, a clerk in the Railway Mail Service, was removed March 11, 1911, because of conduct tending to create discontent and insubordination among his fellow employees.

Very truly, yours,

T. L. Weed,
Chief Clerk.

Hon. H. C. Lodge,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Second Assistant Postmaster General,
April 7, 1911.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Representative Thomas L. Reilly, of Connecticut, called on me this morning in regard to the dismissal of Mr. Quackenbush. He wanted to know whether Mr. Quackenbush could be given a hearing. I told him that he had better take the matter up with you.

Also kindly note the accompanying letter from Senator Lodge to me regarding the same case. He asks me to let him know the facts in the case. What do you wish me to reply?

Joseph Stewart,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE PHILIPPINES,
April 6, 1911.

MY DEAR MR. STEWART: A number of friends of mine in Massachusetts have written to me in behalf of Mr. C. H. Quackenbush, who was recently removed from the Railway Mail Service. I know absolutely nothing about the case personally and do not, therefore, wish to make any recommendation, but I should be greatly obliged if you would let me know the facts in the case.

Very truly, yours, H. C. LODGE.

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Post Office Department.

APRIL 21, 1911.

DEAR SIR: With reference to the letter you addressed to the General Superintendent Railway Mail Service under date of the 8th instant, I beg to advise you that C. H. Quackenbush, a clerk in the Railway Mail Service, was removed March 11, 1911, because of conduct tending to create discontent and insubordination among his fellow employees.

Very truly, yours, T. L. WEED,
Chief Clerk.

Hon. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 8, 1911.

Hon. ALEXANDER GRANT,
General Superintendent Railway Mail Service,
Post Office Department, City.

MY DEAR SIR: I have received protests from my constituents in Connecticut complaining that Mr. C. H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., a railway mail clerk, has been summarily removed without being given an opportunity to answer the charges made against him. I do not know anything about the case, but I feel sure you will give Mr. Quackenbush a full and fair hearing at the proper time and accord to him an opportunity to clear himself.

Kindly advise me what the situation is.

Yours, very truly, FRANK B. BRANDEGEE.

[Memorandum.]

Charles H. Quackenbush, Boston, Springfield, and New York R. P. O., was removed March 31, 1911, upon order of the Postmaster General, who directed that action because it appeared from reports submitted that such action was in the best interests of the service.

Other papers herewith are application from Mr. Quackenbush for reinstatement and statements from others in his behalf; also an-

nouncement of Quackenbush's candidacy for first division Railway Mail Association presidency and copy of the resolutions which he indorsed.

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert as American citizens engaged in public service that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens and we demand the rescinding of this order.

(This resolution was made at the meeting of February 12, at Boston, in reference to what is termed by some of the clerks the "gag rule" of the President.)

BOSTON, MASS.

A regular quarterly meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association, was held at Boston, Mass., Sunday, February 12, 1911. President Walton called the meeting to order at 2.30 p. m., 225 members being present. Minutes of the last meeting read and approved.

On motion, it was voted that only members of the association should be allowed to attend the meeting.

President Walton addressed the meeting at length, telling what action had been taken by the national executive committee to relieve the situation.

On motion, it was voted that a committee be appointed from the floor to whom all the resolutions that had been read should be referred, and that they should draft a set of resolutions to be presented to the meeting.

The following resolutions were adopted, and the secretary was ordered to transmit a copy of the resolutions to the Railway Post Office for publication. Following are the resolutions:

Whereas we, railway postal clerks of the First Division of the Railway Mail Service, have reason to be dissatisfied with conditions as at present existing, due to recent ideas of economy, thereby imposing innumerable hardships on the clerks of the service and impairing their efficiency to the great detriment of the public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That an average of five hours of terminal, car, and road duty, or 100 miles, shall constitute a day's work for a railway postal clerk; that above hours shall be computed on a year of 289 working days.

Resolved, That we, being the only class of Government employees required to travel on Government business without receiving adequate traveling allowance, feel that our traveling pay should be increased to at least $2 per day.

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which prohibits freedom of speech on the part of Government employees; we assert as American citizens engaged in public service that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens; we demand the rescinding of the order.

Resolved, That all grievances arising between the officers of the Post Office Department and the railway mail postal clerks be submitted to our superior officials through a committee appointed by the clerks, and that in case no agreement is thereby reached said committee shall have the privilege of direct appeal to Congress.

Resolved, That to reestablish the former efficiency of the postal mail service is of the highest importance to the public and can best be accomplished by the enforcement of these resolutions.

Resolved, We believe that our national executive committee should engage a competent person who is not a Government employee to represent our interest at times at Washington or elsewhere, and that the per capita tax should be increased sufficiently to cover salaries regarding same.

Resolved, That the meeting appoint a committee of 10 from the floor to draft such changes in the division constitution and the national constitution as will materially strengthen the association, as owing to present limitations it has been ineffective, said committee to report at a special meeting not later than March 10, 1911.

STAMFORD, CONN., *March 9, 1911.*

Fellow members of the first division, Railway Mail Association:

After due consideration, I beg to announce that I am a candidate for the office of president of your honorable body. In connection with this announcement I wish to say that I have not asked the permission of nor consulted with any living being, and therefore am not pledged in any way to any man, nor will I be, and only to such measures as I now do, or later will, publicly indorse. I accept and indorse every word of the resolutions adopted at the meeting held in Boston on February 12. I believe fully in both the justice and expediency of "service promotion," and will endeavor to impress upon the clerks themselves first, and later the department, and the public, the reasonableness and advisability of this great epoch-marking change. I am in favor of the "Goulden retirement bill." I am not in favor of making the Harpoon our association paper, believing that our own paper, the Railway Post Office, under its present editor, Mr. Kidwell, will prove entirely satisfactory.

I believe that all our requests for better conditions are founded in reason and justice and, if granted, will result in an increased efficiency fully commensurate with the cost, and are therefore in line with an enlightened public policy.

As to where I stand on any other question, I will answer anyone at any time. In conclusion, I have no personal ambitions to be attained through this office other than to advance the interests of all clerks of the Railway Mail Service, and only hope to benefit personally to the same extent that all are benefited.

Fraternally, yours,

C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
Boston, Springfield, and New York R. P. O.

N. B.—I have been asked, "Would I withdraw in favor of a stronger (?) candidate, should one be forthcoming?" My answer is, Positively no. And I promise those who support my candidacy that I will stick until the last ballot is counted and make an aggressive fight all the way.

C. H. Q.

APRIL 26, 1911.

SIR: I am directed by the Postmaster General to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 21st instant, transmitting a copy of resolutions adopted by the Board of Common Council of the City of Stamford, Conn., with reference to the removal of C. H. Quackenbush from the position of railway postal clerk.

Very truly, yours,

A. L. DAVIS, *Acting Chief Clerk.*

Hon. EDWIN W. HIGGINS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1911.

Hon. F. H. HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I inclose resolutions of the Stamford (Conn.) Court of Common Council as to the dismissal of C. H. Quackenbush from the postal service.

Respectfully,

EDWIN W. HIGGINS.

Whereas Mr. C. H. Quackenbush, a respected and honorable citizen of the city of Stamford, Conn., after having served in the Railway Mail Service as a postal clerk for the period of 12 years, rendering efficient and faithful service at all times, whose record bears no tangible evidence of disloyalty or inefficiency, was on the 3d day of April, 1911, summarily removed from the Railway Mail Service without being allowed a hearing or an opportunity to defend himself against whatever charges the Post Office Department may have against him; and

Whereas we believe this action on the part of the Post Office Department to be inconsistent with the civil-service rules and not in accord with the true principles of Americanism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the City Council of the City of Stamford, Conn., duly assembled, hereby earnestly request and urge the congressional representation of the State of Connecticut, both Senators and Representatives, to cooperate in bringing about an opportunity for Mr. Quackenbush to be heard in order that he may be allowed to defend himself in a reasonable manner against the charges assigned for his removal from said service as we believe in justice to his character and reputation for the future it is due him, and that a copy of this resolution be at once sent to each Senator and Representative from Connecticut in Congress.

Approved April 11, 1911.

CHARLES E. ROWELL, *Mayor.*

I hereby certify that the within and foregoing is a true and correct transcript and copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Board of Common Council of the City of Stamford, Conn., at a regular meeting held April 10, 1911.

Dated at the city of Stamford, Conn., this 18th day of April, 1911.

Attest:

J. H. PROVOST,
City Clerk of Stamford, Conn.

MAY 6, 1911.

HERBERT M. CHASE,
84 State Street, Boston, Mass.:

Answering your telegram, will be able to see you Tuesday.

———— ————,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

BOSTON, MASS, *May 6, 1911.*

Hon. JOS. STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.:

As attorney for Charles H. Quackenbush, president First Division Railway Mail Association, state positively Quackenbush was misrepresented in Boston Herald this morning. Quackenbush is and has been opposed to organization of labor in Post Office Department, and it has been largely due to his efforts that no organization has been perfected in first division. Shall be in Washington Monday or Tuesday next week. Can I see you? Wire, my expense.

HERBERT M. CHASE,
84 State Street, Boston.

MAY 9, 1911.

SIR: The attorney for Mr. C. H. Quackenbush, the railway postal clerk who was recently removed, called upon me yesterday, and in the course of conversation admitted that the proceedings of the meeting held by the clerks on March 12, 1911, show that Quackenbush withdrew the resolution introduced by him and accepted as a substitute the resolution introduced by Mr. Slocum, which read as follows:

Whereas one of our members has been removed from the service; and
Whereas no charge was brought, no defense allowed, and appeal is not granted; and
Whereas said member claims that he is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Be it therefore
Resolved, That we, members of the First Division Railway Mail Association do hereby protest against such action, and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought.

The attorney, however, claims that Mr. Quackenbush did not agree to accept the substitute, and that he took no action in the matter of supporting it. In my presence, the attorney called up Mr. Quackenbush on the telephone, and in response to my inquiry as to what action he took with reference to resolutions introduced on Sunday, February 12, he replied to the attorney that he attended the meeting of that date, but that it related only to the matter of engaging a competent person to represent the interests of the clerks at Washington or elsewhere, etc., and that it had no relation to any discourteous resolutions against the department. From the files I find that the following action was taken at that meeting:

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert, as American citizens engaged in public service, that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens, and we demand the rescinding of this order.

In view of the statements made by Mr. Quackenbush, I would thank you to obtain immediately affidavits showing just what action took place at the meeting of March 12 with reference to the Slocum resolution; also, what action was taken by Mr. Quackenbush at the meeting of February 12, at which time it was demanded by resolution that the President's order be rescinded. Please let these affidavits come forward promptly.

Very respectfully,

———— ————,
Chief Inspector.

THE INSPECTOR IN CHARGE, *Boston, Mass.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 9, 1911.

THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

DEAR GENERAL STEWART: As the committee only required that the reasons be filed for which Quackenbush was removed, I would suggest that the simple reason be given that he was removed on account of his disloyalty and disposition to create strife and discord among railway postal clerks. I am satisfied that Quackenbush's attorney made a false statement when he alleged that Quackenbush took no part in the resolutions of March 12. The papers indicate that it was a "frame up" between Slocum and Quackenbush. My private opinion is that

instead of organizing with the labor unions in that division the labor unions decided to capture the regular association. Had they not taken this tack Quackenbush would have followed up the meeting with McCarthy, in my opinion, and organized for affiliation with the American Federation of Labor.

The inclosed memorandum, however, will give you a clear analysis of the papers on file which I have just finished going through. I am satisfied that if it is worked adroitly, we can prove that the slip calling the meeting at the Central Labor Union rooms is in the handwriting of Quackenbush, and I have retained this slip and will show it to you and file with the other papers later after I have secured a lot of his correspondence for comparative purposes. It appears that the principal meeting which was held at the Central Labor Union rooms was held just previous to the regular meeting of the clerks' association, that same evening. The first meeting was no doubt for the purpose of organizing and laying plans to raise a row in the second one. These, however, are only matters which have come to my mind in reviewing the papers and are not included in the memorandum which is confined to proven facts.

I return to you the entire file.

Respectfully,

R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector.

[Memorandum for the Second Assistant Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 9, 1911.

It appears that on Sunday, February 12, 1911, a meeting of certain railway postal clerks was held at Boston, Mass., in which the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert, as American citizens engaged in public service, that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens, and we demand a rescinding of this order.

The above resolution had reference to an order promulgated by the President of the United States. Clerk Quackenbush was at this meeting and his attorney confesses that he took a prominent part therein, and you will find in the papers affidavits of railway postal clerks in attendance showing that they protested against the use of the word "demand" and that Quackenbush insisted that the word "demand" be substituted for the word "request."

It appears that the Second Assistant Postmaster General, subsequent to the date of that meeting, for good and sufficient reasons which are on file in the department and which appear to be quite satisfactory and purely in the interests of the service, recommended the removal of Clerk Slocum. Mr. Quackenbush, at a meeting held on Sunday, March 12, introduced a resolution asking that the department give publicity to the reasons for the dismissal of this clerk, whereupon Slocum introduced a resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the members of the first division, Railway Mail Service, do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought.

Slocum asked Quackenbush to withdraw his resolution and accept the substitute, which the latter agreed to do. You will find affidavits among the papers showing that previous to the introduction of these two resolutions whispered conferences occurred between Slocum and Quackenbush, and the very character and manner in which the resolutions were presented indicates strongly that it was agreed between these two clerks that the matter should be brought up precisely in the manner in which it was, the reason for this being that Slocum was out of the service and was in a position to "demand." Notwithstanding this fact, the affidavits show that Quackenbush spoke in favor of the adoption of the resolution introduced by Slocum and urged its passage.

On the same day (Mar. 12) Quackenbush and a few other railway postal clerks met Frank H. McCarthy, general organizer of a secret union, at the Central Labor Union rooms. This meeting was the result of a call for the purpose of interesting railway postal clerks to become affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The meeting was called at 4 p. m., and adjourned within a short time, until after the meeting of the railway mail association, referred to above, was held. A reporter for one of the local papers stated to Railway Postal Clerk Tebbetts, as shown by the latter's affidavit inclosed, that Quackenbush and about a dozen other clerks had been there, but had only remained a few minutes and had gone over to the other meeting, and were going back after the other meeting had closed.

Subsequent to the meeting of February 12 Quackenbush became a candidate for some office in an association of railway postal clerks, and in a communication which he had printed and sent broadcast among the clerks of the division appeared the following:

> I accept and indorse every word of the resolutions adopted at the meeting held in Boston on February 12.

In connection with this meeting at the Central Labor Union rooms, attention is called to the original report of Inspector in Charge Letherman to the effect that the call for this meeting was written out on facing slips, although there were some printed cards which were given to the clerks, and it is the opinion of the inspector in charge that the handwriting on the facing slips is the same as the handwriting of the person who wrote the resolution introduced first at the meeting of March 12 regarding Railway Postal Clerk Slocum. You will find from a close examination that there is a marked resemblance between the handwriting of Quackenbush and that on the facing slip and the original resolution.

From the above it appears that Quackenbush was engaged in leading a protest against and demanding the rescinding of an order issued by the President of the United States, and later engaged in protesting against the removal of a fellow-clerk, and demanding certain action be taken by the department in a case in which he had no official concern. The records of the department, so far as I can find, do not show that Mr. Quackenbush took any of his alleged grievances up in the regular official course of business with the Second Assistant Postmaster General. Had he done so in language that was couched in respectful terms and showing the proper consideration for necessary governmental discipline, they would no doubt have been given careful consideration, such as the records in the

.uce of the Second Assistant Postmaster General indicate all clerks t all times have received.

The affidavits which you will find on file in the case show unmis-.akably that Quackenbush was considered a disturbing element among the railway postal clerks. He announced publicly his conviction that the Harpoon, a publication printed at Denver, Colo., of a scurrilous and vituperous character, was conducting an open and fair fight for railway postal clerks and should receive the support of all such clerks. The language used in this publication and the gross misstatements made therein would warrant the belief that any clerk rendering it support could not be loyal to his superior officers nor to the department. One of the strongest clerks in the New England division makes oath that he was strongly impressed from his observation of Clerk Quackenbush of his evident lack of regard for the wishes and orders of his superior officers in the service, and that he believed the attitude which he exhibited at both of the meetings referred to in this memorandum was such as to tend to spread discord and strife among the railway postal clerks. While there is nothing in the records to show that the prompt removal of Clerk Slocum from the service had a tendency to stop any further attempts at affiliation with McCarthy and his labor organization, it is not unreasonable to presume that Quackenbush, in view of his connection with Slocum, was made aware that the department's position with reference to secret unions was of such a character as to warrant his separation from the service if he became openly affiliated or was found to be associating with the organizer of a secret union.

In addition to the above facts, it is shown that Quackenbush had a fist fight with a fellow clerk sometime ago by the name of Strong, in the Railway Mail Service dormitory at Boston, and previous to that he engaged in a fist fight in New York City with the driver of a mail wagon very much under his size. These incidents indicate that he is of an impulsive nature and that the department is justified in having peremptorily removed him from the service on account of his disloyalty and disposition in creating strife and discord among the railway postal clerks. The usual means of laying his grievances, if he had any, before the department were at his disposal, and he was not justified in assuming an arbitrary and disloyal attitude toward the department.

It is questionable whether a clerk with a record of this kind can be considered from an administrative standpoint in any other light than that of an inefficient employee on account of his deficiency in the cardinal qualities which any Government official should possess.

The impulsive nature of this man is fully exhibited in the affidavit of Railway Postal Clerk Harry W. Strong, inclosed, which indicates that Quackenbush struck him while he was sitting down and without the slightest warning of any kind. It appears that at the time the attack was made, however, Quackenbush had drunk three or four mugs of Sterling ale.

R. S. Sharp, *Chief Inspector.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
NEW YORK DIVISION,
New York, N. Y., May 9, 1911.

Mr. W. W. DICKSON,
Inspector in Charge, New York, N. Y.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith communication from the chief post-office inspector, directing that an investigation be made to ascertain the facts concerning an alleged altercation between Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush, of the Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office, with headquarters at Boston, and a mail-wagon driver at New York City, and to submit the following special report:

Upon receipt of your letter I immediately began to investigate this matter and learned that Charles H. Quackenbush had been dropped from the Railway Mail Service several days before this case was referred to me. Inquiry was made of W. J. Opdyke, who has charge of city mail transportation in New York City, but he was unable to give any information concerning the trouble Quackenbush had with the driver of a mail wagon. He explained that for the past two years railway postal clerks have not come in contact with drivers of mail wagons, as the registry transfer was established at the Grand Central Depot.

I communicated with Mr. E. J. Ryan, Superintendent of Railway Mail Service at Boston, who informed me that he had no personal knowledge of the altercation referred to. He supplied me with a list of clerks who from time to time ran in the same crew with Quackenbush, and I made inquiry among some of these men, without result, until I finally had a talk with John Halloran, railway postal clerk on the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office (night line), who informed me that about 10 or 11 years ago he recalled Quackenbush did have trouble with a mail-wagon driver at the Grand Central Depot and that he became involved in a fist fight, with the result that Quackenbush got the worst of the altercation. Mr. Halloran said that the matter had almost entirely passed from his mind and that he could not give any of the details, nor did he remember the name of the mail-wagon driver or what provoked the trouble. Mr. Halloran also said that Mr. Quackenbush was not drinking at the time, that he was perfectly sober.

In view of the fact that Quackenbush is now out of the service and that the altercation referred to happened so many years ago, I find it impossible to obtain full details and therefore recommend that the accompanying papers be forwarded to the chief post-office inspector for his consideration.

Very respectfully,

F. A. O'BRIEN,
Post Office Inspector.

Report examined, approved, and forwarded to chief inspector, May 10, 1911.

E. S. KINCAID,
Acting Post Office Inspector in Charge Division.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT FIRST DIVISION,
Boston, Mass., April 12, 1911.

Mr. F. A. O'BRIEN,
Post Office Inspector, New York, N. Y.

SIR: I inclose herewith a list of the railway postal clerks who have run with Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush during the last three years.

I have no personal knowledge of the altercation to which you refer between Mr. Quackenbush and another party.

Very respectfully,

EDW. J. RYAN,
Superintendent.

CLERKS AND EX-CLERKS WHO RAN WITH MR. C. H. QUACKENBUSH SINCE APRIL, 1908.

Goggin, E. F., 12 Abbott Street, Worcester, Mass.
Wheeler, M. L., Box 239, Stratford, Conn.
Mansfield, J. S., 707 Center Street, Wallingford, Conn.
Price, H. A., Warehouse Point, Conn.
Merten, F. W., 820 South Oak Drive, Williamsbridge Station, New York City.
Kennedy, E. J., 75 Woolsey Street, New Haven, Conn.
Sturtevant, H. W., 26 Beach Street, Springfield, Mass.
Bridgett, E. J., 217 Hall Avenue, Wallingford, Conn.
Pierce, C. D., 44 Rowe Street, Auburndale, Mass.
Blain, E. J., Albion, R. I.
Carney, A. E., South Meriden, Conn.
Hallock, N., 76 First Street, Clifton, N. J.
Murphy, J. F., 320 Blatchley Avenue, New Haven, Conn.
Long, W. F., 80 Pearl Street, Hartford, Conn. (resigned).
Hotchkiss, P. T. (sub), Cheshire, Conn.
Fleming, W. F. A. (sub), 90 Vernon Street, Worcester, Mass.
McMahon, J. P., 61 Spring Street, Meriden, Conn.
Weed, B. F., Cherry Street, New Canaan, Conn.
Bradford, G. R. (sub), 15 Court Street, New Haven, Conn.
Lawson, W. B., 71 Webster Street, Meriden, Conn.
Cochran, W. H., 73 Woolsey Street, New Haven, Conn.
Southworth, M. K., 855 La Fayette Street, Bridgeport, Conn.
Bailey, F. A., 84 Buckingham Street, Springfield, Mass.
O'Neill, J. P., 1371 Washington Avenue, New York City.
Godfrey, C. H., Rowayton, Conn.
Bennett, W. L., Canton, Mass.
Little, P., 159 Leete Street, West Haven, Conn.
Talbot, W. A., 75 Princeton Street, Springfield, Mass.
Moffitt, N. C., 56 Roosevelt Street, Bridgeport, Conn.
Kelly, M. F., 499 West One hundred and thirty-fifth Street, New York City.
Hackett, J. W., 143 West Street, New Haven, Conn.
Tongue, C. A., 1908 South Main Street, Fall River, Mass.
Quinlivan, D. E., 87 North Orchard Street, Wallingford, Conn.
Hallock, L. E., Hubbardston, Mass.
Burke, William, 6 Sutton Road, Whitinsville, Mass.
Nagel, W. J., 58 South Avenue, Meriden, Conn.
Ohr, E. G., 85 Acushnet Avenue, Springfield, Mass. (resigned).
Ohr, J., jr., 36 Prospect Street, Wallingford, Conn. (resigned).
Roope, H. M., 452 Market Street, Lawrence, Mass.
Murray, T. J., 191 English Street, New Haven, Conn.
Ayer, C. S., box 136, South Coventry, Conn.
Winston, E. J., 97 School Street, Taunton, Mass.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
New York, N. Y., April 10, 1911.

Mr. F. A. O'BRIEN,
Post Office Inspector, New York, N. Y.

SIR: I transmit herewith communication of the chief inspector requesting that an investigation be at once instituted regarding Charles H. Quackenbush, of the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office, with headquarters in Boston, charged with having made an assault upon a mail-wagon driver in this city, with the result that he received a good beating.

Please take this matter up immediately and make a thorough investigation, taking note of the direction of the chief inspector that all publicity possible should be avoided.

Very respectfully,
W. W. DICKSON,
Inspector in Charge.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 7, 1911.

SIR: It is alleged that some time ago Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush, of the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office, with headquarters at Boston, made an assault upon the driver of a mail wagon at New York, and that the driver gave him a good whipping.

I wish you would immediately ascertain the facts, taking affidavits from the driver of the wagon and any witnesses that can be located. Please act on this matter promptly, avoiding publicity as much as possible, and have report of the exact facts forwarded at the earliest date practicable.

You might also ascertain if Quackenbush was drinking at the time of his encounter with the driver of the mail wagon.

Respectfully,
R. S. SHARP, *Chief Inspector.*

THE INSPECTOR IN CHARGE,
New York City.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 12, 1911.

Respectfully referred to the Second Assistant Postmaster General for connection with the file of papers in his possession bearing on former Railway Postal Clerk C. H Quackenbush.

Transmitting a communication of the inspector in charge at Boston, Mass , bearing date of the 11th instant, and affidavits submitted therewith relative to the activity of former Clerk Quackenbush at a meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association, held in Boston, March 12, 1911.

R. S. SHARP, *Chief Inspector.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., May 11, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Confirming my promise in telegram of yesterday, in relation to the Quackenbush matter, I have the honor to hand you herewith

an exact copy of the records of the meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association held in Boston, March 12, 1911, and an affidavit from H. F. French, railway postal clerk, who swears that the attached are the complete records of the meeting of that date. Mr. French's affidavit bears additional weight for the reason that he is a personal friend of Quackenbush and was one of his leading advocates in his candidacy for election as president of the First Division Railway Mail Association.

You will note that in this meeting Quackenbush offered a resolution in regard to the removal of Harry E. Slocum, railway postal clerk, from the Railway Mail Service. The minutes show that on Quackenbush's motion being seconded, this resolution was adopted. They also show that immediately Mr. Slocum took the floor and read the following resolution:

Whereas one of our members has been removed, and whereas no charges were brought, no defense allowed, and appeal not granted, and whereas said member is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, members of the First Division Railway Mail Association, do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials. Said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought.

When Slocum had finished reading his resolution, Quackenbush withdrew his resolution in favor of the one offered by Slocum.

I also hand you herewith exact copies of a portion of the minutes or records of the meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association held February 12, 1911, in Boston, and affidavit made by H. R. Stoddard, secretary of the association, to the effect that these are exact copies of the records of the meeting. I have marked with a blue pencil the resolution referred to in your letter of May 9, which was passed at the meeting of February 12.

You will note on the page marked "8" that Quackenbush moved that an exact copy be sent to the Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General, general superintendent, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee, and the Railway Post Office, which is a newspaper. The question was brought up as to who was to sign and send them, and Mr. Quackenbush added to his motion that the secretary of the association be ordered to transmit copies of the resolutions to the persons named. This was passed. However, Mr. Stoddard, the secretary, did not comply with the motion that the resolutions adopted be forwarded to the parties mentioned above, and, in my opinion, showed good judgment in refusing to send them.

Following the page just mentioned are exact copies of all the resolutions which were passed and which Mr. Quackenbush offered as a resolution be sent to the officers mentioned above.

In this connection, I regret exceedingly that I have been unable to obtain but very little of the handwriting of C. H. Quackenbush. I hand you herewith his signature, which was taken from a letter addressed to the secretary of the association, Mr. H. R. Stoddard, with his consent and at the suggestion of Clerk French. Mr. French has stated to me that he thinks he can send me a few samples of Mr. Quackenbush's handwriting. Superintendent Ryan informed me that, while it might seem strange to me or to anyone, yet it nevertheless was a fact that he did not have any correspondence, papers, or documents in the handwriting of Mr. Quackenbush. It is barely

possible that if you search the papers that I have forwarded you from time to time you will find the slip upon which is written the resolution which, according to the statement of Mr. Walton, who presided at the meeting, was written by Quackenbush and handed over to either Mr. Walton or the secretary, and this was the writing which I believed was the same as that upon the facing slips requesting the clerks to attend a meeting with the American Federation of Labor.

Very respectfully,

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

I, H. F. French, railway mail clerk, do hereby swear that the attached are the complete records of the meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association held March 12, 1911.

H. F. FRENCH.

Subscribed and sworn to at Boston, Mass., this 11th day of May, A. D. 1911, before me.

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Post Office Inspector in Charge.

A special meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association was held at Castle Square Hall, 446 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass., Sunday, March 12, 1911, with President Walton in the chair and about 125 members present. The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p. m., and the following message, by telephone, was received from the secretary and read by the president.

Will not be able to be present this afternoon on account of sickness. Will try and send books later. No special business.

——— ——— was appointed secretary pro tempore by the chair.

Mr. ——— ———, chairman of the constitution committee, presented the changes in the constitution as suggested by his committee.

At this point the president requested that any person in the room who was not a member would please withdraw.

A motion was made and seconded that the meeting be polled. Tellers were appointed and report made that all those in the room were members.

The following changes suggested in the constitution were read:

* * *

It was voted to take up each suggested change separately. A point of order was raised by ——— ——— on discussion of the different clauses, and after discussion and questioning by National Secretary Wood, ——— ———, ——— ——— the point was withdrawn.

On motion of ——— ———, seconded by Quackenbush, it was voted that each proposed amendment to the constitution be printed and forwarded to each member with the ballot for the annual election to be voted upon by members by a yes or no vote. ——— ——— offered an amendment to the motion, as follows: "That the result of vote on the above be read at annual meeting before the vote was taken on the changes." After discussion the motion was withdrawn in favor of new business.

On motion of ——— ———, seconded by Quackenbush, it was voted that the report of the constitution be accepted as progressive and that the committee be thanked.

Further report of the committee was submitted that the following be issued as a referendum vote on the ballot:

* * * * * * *

A motion was made and seconded that this resolution be accepted. A motion was made and seconded and it was voted to amend this resolution so as to substitute the word "manager" for the word "secretary." Discussion by different members.

On presentation of the case of the removal from the service of Mr. Slocum by Quackenbush, it was moved and seconded that the rules be suspended and Mr. Slocum allowed the floor.

Mr. Slocum asked the president if Mr. Grant had asked him if he (Slocum) was progressing with the Harpoon Club or if any other department official had asked this question. To this the president answered in the negative.

It was then requested that Mr. Slocum read his removal papers, and this was done by him. After some discussion, Mr. ——— ——— stated that in conversation with National President Canfield that he was informed by him that any clerk could be removed from the service without any cause being stated.

The president at this point called for new business.

Quackenbush asked for advice relative to the removal of Mr. Slocum. ——— ——— stated that Mr. Canfield would take the matter up if presented to him.

On being asked in regard to action of Congress on travel pay, the president read the same. Discussion.

On motion of Quackenbush, seconded, it was voted that the proposed amendments be taken up and discussed at once. Moved that the secretary be instructed to inclose with ballots a copy of the proposed amendments to the constitution to be used in the coming annual election for an expression of sentiment as a guide for the action of the annual meeting before the final vote was taken. This was so voted.

In discussion of the proposed grievance board, it was moved that the election of same be made by the members under the respective chief clerks instead of by the president. After discussion motion was withdrawn and the amendment was tabled as read.

Question was raised at this point as to whether there was a person in the room who was not a member, and upon finding that an error had been made it was moved and seconded that an apology be offered. Passed unanimously by a rising vote.

Motion was made that newspaper reporter be admitted.

After discussion at some length amendments were tabled to read as follows (copy inclosed).

A motion was made and seconded it was noted to ask newspaper reporters to please withdraw from meeting. It was found that they had already done so and the following resolution was offered by Quackenbush:

Resolved, That whereas the general superintendent has summarily removed from the service Harry E. Slocum, we feel that in order that we, as clerks, may conduct ourselves in a manner wholly acceptable to the department, that the reasons for the dismissal of this clerk be given publicity.

On motion of Quackenbush, and seconded, this resolution was adopted.

Mr. Slocum took the floor and read the following resolution, which he asked to have substituted for the one which was just adopted:

Whereas one of our members has been removed; and whereas no charges were brought, no defense allowed, and appeal not granted; and whereas said member is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, members of the First Division Railway Mail Association, do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought.

Quackenbush withdrew his resolution in favor of the one offered by Slocum.

After discussion the changing of the word "demand" to the word "request" the motion as presented by Mr. Slocum was adopted by a yea-and-nay vote.

On motion of ——— ———, seconded, it was voted to instruct the secretary to send a night telegram to General Superintendent Grant containing the foregoing resolution.

After a talk by Slocum on his situation in regard to newspaper articles the meeting adjourned.

A. C. Brodrick,
Secretary Pro Tempore.

These minutes have never been read and approved at any succeeding meeting.

I, H. R. Stoddard, secretary of the First Division Railway Mail Association, do hereby swear that the attached are exact copies of a portion of the records of the meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association held February 12, 1911.

H. R. Stoddard.

Subscribed and sworn to at Boston, Mass., this 11th day of May, A. D. 1911, before me.

Lawrence Letherman,
Post Office Inspector in Charge.

---

* * * * * * *

The following was taken up and passed:

Resolved, That we being the only class of Government employees required to travel on Government business without receiving adequate travel allowance, that we feel that our travel pay should be increased to at least $2 per day.

The original of the foregoing resolution was not received by the secretary, and was under considerable discussion, but was finally changed to read as shown above.

The following was taken up:

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids the freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert as American citizens engaged in public service that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens, and we demand the rescinding of this order.

President called the meeting's attention to the fact that they were protesting against an Executive order and suggested that the meeting be careful of the language that they used. Chairman of the committee stated that this matter had all been gone over in the committee and they, the committee, was in favor of the resolution as drawn. ——— ——— spoke in favor of the resolutions. Resolution was passed.

The following was read:

Resolved, That all grievances arising between the officials of the department and railway postal clerks be submitted to our superior officers through a committee appointed by the clerks and that in case no agreement is reached said committee shall have the privilege of direct appeal to Congress.

President claimed that the resolution was against the division constitution. ——— ——— stated that such was not a fact and demanded a vote. Passed.

The rest of the resolutions were passed, including the one which was laid on the table. * * * Resolutions as passed inclosed.

The number of the committee was made 10, on motion of ——— ———, and the election of the committee was put off until later.

——— ——— What to do with the resolutions. ——— ——— that they be given to the press. Discussion. Passed.

Quackenbush moved that an exact copy be sent to the Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General, general superintendent, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee and to the Railway Post Office. The question was brought up as to who was to send and sign them. Quackenbush added to his motion that the secretary of the association be ordered to transmit a copy of the resolutions to the persons named. Passed.

(These resolutions were never forwarded to the department officials.)

——— ——— moved that copy of these resolutions be sent to the clerk of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads by night message. After discussion, the ——— was instructed to pick out what resolutions should be sent, and the secretary was ordered to send them.

Moved that the committee of 10 be appointed. Nominations followed.

——— ——— brought up the subject of paying our share of the retirement meeting held at Boston, Mass. The Lawless letters were taken from the table. After considerable discussion the papers were laid on the table again.

——— ——— moved that the press be thanked. Not passed.

——— ——— moved that a vote of thanks be extended to Mr. Walter, editor of the Harpoon, for what he had done. Passed.

——— ———. Question of thanking Congressmen laid on the table.

Amendment of ——— ——— read and referred to the committee.

Meeting adjourned at 10.15 p. m.

H. R. Stoddard, *Secretary.*

These minutes have never been read and approved at any succeeding meeting.

Following are the resolutions as they were passed:

Whereas we, the railway postal clerks of the first division, Railway Mail Service, have reason to be dissatisfied with the conditions as at present existing, due to the recent ideas of economy, thereby imposing unbearable hardships on the clerks in this service and impairing their efficiency, to the great detriment of the public: Therefore be it

Resolved, That an average of five hours' terminal, car, and road duty, or 100 miles, shall constitute a day's work for a railway postal clerk; that above hours be computed on a year of 289 working days.

Resolved, That we, being the only class of Government employees required to travel on Government business without receiving adequate traveling allowance, feel that our travel pay should be increased to at least $2 per day.

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert, as American citizens engaged in public service, that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens, and we demand the rescinding of this order.

Resolved, That all grievances arising between officials of the Post Office Department and railway postal clerks be submitted to our superior officers through a committee appointed by the clerks, and that in case no agreement is thereby reached said committee shall have the privilege of direct appeal to Congress.

Resolved, That to reestablish the former efficiency of the Railway Mail Service is of the highest importance to the public and can best be accomplished by the enforcement of these resolutions.

Resolved, That this meeting appoint a committee of 10 from the floor to draft such changes in the division constitution and the national constitution as will materially strengthen the association, as owing to the present limitations it has been ineffective, said committee to report at a special meeting to be called not later than March 10, 1911.

Resolved, We believe that our national executive committee should engage a competent person who is not a Government employee to represent our interests at all times at Washington or elsewhere, and that the per capita tax be increased sufficiently to cover the salary of the same.

Submitted by Inspector in Charge Letherman, in connection with a communication bearing date the 11th of May, 1911, which was referred to the Second Assistant Postmaster General under date of May 12.

Very respectfully, C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

[Memorandum.]

SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
May 18, 1911.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT,
Division of Railway Mail Service:

I am returning your memorandum of the 9th instant, together with letter from C. H. Quackenbush, of Boston, requesting certain information. As this information is not readily obtainable and our time must first be devoted to the transaction of current official business, you need not furnish it.

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, May 9, 1911.

[Memorandum for the Second Assistant Postmaster General.]

Referring to attached communication from Mr. Quackenbush. We have not this data at hand. It would take a great deal of work

to get it, and some of it probably would not be obtainable. You will remember that Quackenbush was recently removed from the Railway Mail Service, and the question arises as to how much recognition should be given him.

Respectfully,

THEO. INGALLS,
General Superintendent.

FIRST DIVISION RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
May 2, 1911.

Mr. EDW. J. RYAN,
Superintendent Railway Mail Service, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Mr. G. A. Nettleton, recently elected a delegate to our next annual convention, desires statistics concerning the Railway Mail Service of the first division, and also the Boston post office, as enumerated below:

For the Railway Mail Service: Number of hours worked per capita per annum; number pieces of mail handled per capita per annum; number cards examined on per capita per annum; average salary per capita per annum; number of miles traveled per capita per annum. Hours credited to clerks for work done at home to be computed same as hours worked in car.

For the Boston, Mass., post office: Number of hours worked per capita per annum; number of pieces of mail handled per capita per annum; average salary per capita per annum. Number of cards examined on per capita per annum.

If these statistics are obtainable, will you kindly furnish them or direct me to the source from which they are to be had?

Very respectfully,

C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., May 3, 1911.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.:

What reply shall I make to Mr. Quackenbush?

So far as we know, the Boston office has never collected any data as to the pieces of mail handled per capita per annum, or the number of hours worked.

EDW. J. RYAN, *Superintendent.*

FIRST DIVISION NOTICE.

To the members of the First Division Railway Mail Association:

This is to advise those members who have failed to pay the extra assessment of $1, which was levied on the members at a meeting of the executive committee held May 3, that the same must be paid on or before the time that assessment No. 77 of the beneficiary department is due, in order for the member to be in good standing.

H. R. STODDARD, *Secretary.*

[Personal.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., May 25, 1911.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have at last succeeded in obtaining good samples of the handwriting of C. H. Quackenbush. I hand you herewith two letters written by him to A. C. Walton, late president of the First Division Railway Mail Association. As I recall the handwriting on the facing slip, notifying railway mail clerks of the meeting with the American Federation of Labor representative, it very much resembles the handwriting of the address on the envelope herewith mailed January 12, on Boston, Springfield and New York Railway Post Office.

The First Division Railway Mail Association held a meeting May 21, with about 50 in attendance. On May 3 a meeting of the executive committee of the association was held, at which an extra assessment of $1 was levied on all members of the association. I am informed that this was done for the purpose of raising a fund for Quackenbush and Slocum. A large number of the clerks do not want to pay this assessment, but are coerced into doing so because, if they do not, they are put in bad standing, and lose their insurance in the association. I am informed that the association has already paid $75 to Quackenbush and $50 to Slocum.

At the meeting of May 21, the secretary was instructed to send out the following notice:

To the members of the First Division Railway Mail Association:

This is to advise those members who have failed to pay the extra assessment of $1 which was levied on the members at a meeting of the executive committee held May 3, that the same must be paid on or before the time that assessment No. 77 of the beneficiary department is due in order for the member to be in good standing.

H. R. STODDARD, *Secretary.*

I am also informed that during the entire meeting of May 21 Mr. Chase, an attorney for Quackenbush, was in attendance. The greater portion of the time of the meeting was devoted to devising means to obtain the reinstatement to the Railway Mail Service of Quackenbush. Mr. Chase, I am told, advised the members to get up a petition for all the clerks to sign, showing that Mr. Quackenbush had done nothing to warrant his removal. It is understood that the meeting voted to get up this petition. I shall endeavor to obtain a copy of the petition, and if successful will send same to you.

I am told also, and I think it important that you know this, that the meeting voted to change the minutes of the meeting of March 12 to the extent that that portion stating that Quackenbush withdrew his resolution for a hearing for Slocum and accepted Slocum's resolution demanding a hearing, be changed. I presume they will make this change show that Quackenbush did not withdraw his resolution and accept Slocum's. This, I presume, was done upon the advice of Mr. Chase, the attorney.

I am informed also that the executive committee of the association has asked the department to return the resolutions passed at the

February 12 meeting. These contained the resolution on what is called by them the "gag rule."

In the regular way provided by their constitution, Quackenbush and Slocum were removed by the officers of the association after their removal from the Railway Mail Service by the department. Recently they were both reinstated in the association by the executive committee of the national association, of which Canfield and Roberts are the moving spirits.

Very respectfully,

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

STAMFORD, CONN., *January 18, 1911.*

A. C. WALTON,
Boston, Mass.

FRIEND AL.: Yours of 15th is before me. Thanks for your prompt reply. I suppose you think that I have joined the ranks of the insurgents and that it is a case of "Et tu brute," or words to that effect. There's nothing to that view of the case, however, only I have championed you so vehemently that the "critics" take great pleasure in pounding you to me and I want to forestall them to some extent. Though, in all other matters (save only adverse criticism of yourself, in which I think, and have told them so, that they are fools and ingrates). I am with them hand and glove, and I think that if you hope to hold any considerable number of them in line, another meeting should be called as soon as possible; committees notified to report thereat, etc. I understand that the officers of the association have been asked what the men wanted in the way of hours, and that they have replied a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 7 hours road duty. If this is so, or any reply whatever made without consultation with the rank and file, it is a mistake. The men are too wrought up, too exasperated with things in general, and much too sore on their officers with or without reason for it to be wise for them to attempt to answer for the men at this time. Well, this will do for the present. I hope to see you soon.

Yours, faithfully,

QUACK.

STAMFORD, CONN., *January 12, 1911.*

A. C. WALTON, Esq.,
Boston, Mass.

FRIEND AL.: Do you expect to call a meeting of the association in the near future? If so, please let me know when and where; if not, please let me know if there is not some provision whereby a certain number of members (and how many) can call one; and if they can select the place of meeting?

Very truly, yours,

C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
47 Lockwood Avenue.

MAY 26, 1911.

SIR: Referring to the case of late Railway Postal Clerk C. H. Quackenbush and previous correspondence, particularly to my memorandum of May 9, in which the statement was made that notice

of a meeting of railway postal clerks held on March 12, 1911, at the Central Labor Union rooms at Boston, Mass., was issued by Mr. Quackenbush upon a blank facing slip, I have to transmit herewith samples of the handwriting of Mr. Quackenbush, consisting of letters written by him to Railway Postal Clerk A. C. Walton under dates of January 12 and 18, 1911, and the facing slip in question, reading as follows:

"On March 12, at 4 p. m., Central Labor Union rooms, 873 Washington Street, Boston, meeting. (All invited.)"

There is also transmitted herewith report of Inspector in Charge Letherman of May 25 relating to this subject, and special attention is invited to page 2, relative to a change in the minutes of the meeting of March 12.

Respectfully,

———— ————,
Chief Inspector.

The Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Post Office Department,
Washington, May 27, 1911.

Sir: For your information I transmit herewith copy of a communication of Mr. Herbert M. Chase, Boston, Mass., who is attorney for former Railway Postal Clerk Quackenbush, embodying certain inquiries made of clerks of the first division.

Respectfully,

R. S. Sharp, *Chief Inspector.*

The Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Boston, Mass., *May 26, 1911.*

Hon. R. S. Sharp,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

Sir: I inclose circular letter handed me this day by a postal clerk in this division, and thought you might be interested in reading it if you have not already done so.

Very respectfully,

M. C. Duryea,
Post Office Inspector.

Boston, Mass., *May 22, 1911.*

To the clerks of the first division, Railway Mail Service.

Gentlemen: As counsel for the Railway Mail Association, on May 11, 1911, I conducted a hearing in Washington, before the Hon. Joseph Stewart, Second Assistant Postmaster General, said hearing being held for the purpose of obtaining the reinstatement of Charles H. Quackenbush in the service. It developed that the department had received certain information, and acting on that information had removed Mr. Quackenbush from the service, specifically charging him with "fomenting unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks; for being a disturbing element among them and agitator against the proper administrative acts and against the policies of the department; for indorsing the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its condition, and its officers; and for inciting insubordination" among his fellow clerks. We offered evidence to show that Mr. Quackenbush had not been guilty of any of the charges above outlined. As a result, Gen. Stewart reserved his decision on our petition for reinstatement until such time as we should return with further evidence to substantiate our position.

In order to furnish the evidence that Gen. Stewart desires, we are sending to the clerks of this division the list of questions below. Each letter is numbered. Will you kindly answer the questions after careful deliberation, signing your name to the perforated sheet? I will guarantee that your identity will not be disclosed. We strongly urge an answer by return mail.

Very truly, yours,

HERBERT M. CHASE,
84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service? Answer.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division? Answer.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks. Answer. If so, in what particular?
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division? Answer. If so, in what particular?
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department? Answer. If so, in what particular?
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers? Answer. If so, in what particular?
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks? Answer. If so, in what particular?
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor? Answer. If so, in what particular?
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division? Answer. If so, when and where?

No. 224.

[Perforation.]

No. 224.

Do not detach.

This sheet to be torn off by Mr. Chase and is used only to guarantee that the document is genuine.

Name ——— ———. Assignment ——— ———.

No. 830.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 41.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 23.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 593.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have not known of his doing this.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I have been informed that he does not advocate this.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 550.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know about.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you, or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 85.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 742.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 370.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No; not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its condition, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 194.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Have no personal knowledge nor have I ever heard of his fomenting discontent.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 545.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never heard of him; no.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No; not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 379.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 835.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A No.

6 Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1047.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 12.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 324.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 220.

1 Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; the contrary is true.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No; he opposed no act or order of the department.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. When such a policy was being advocated by others, Mr. Quackenbush, in a circular letter announcing his candidacy for president of the first division Railway Mail Association strongly disapproved of such a course.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 254.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. As far as I know he has not.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1084.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quack enbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks—A. Not to my best knowledge and belief.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my best knowledge and belief.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my best knowledge and belief.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my best knowledge and belief.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my best knowledge and belief.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I have ever heard.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has never urged me; neither have I heard him talk this matter to anyone else.

No. 969.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. He has not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No; never.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; but he has opposed such affiliation.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 794.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; and he strongly advised against such a policy.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1079.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

Don't remember ever hearing of his existence.

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 977.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 729.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 419.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1027.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 882.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not any.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 199.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge in the least.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 451.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. In my opinion he has done nothing which should cause discontent among his fellow clerks.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I have heard him say he was opposed to the clerks being affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has never asked me to join and I have never heard him ask anyone else to join any labor organization.

No. 1010.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division? —A. No.

No. 843.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 36.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I don't believe he has.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 921.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I certainly never considered him such.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Quite the reverse, to judge from his circular.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. On the contrary, he showed himself strongly opposed to it in his platform.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 60.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division? —A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks. —A. He did not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division? —A. No.

No. 790.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Have no knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Do not know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Do not know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1080.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. None to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1020.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Ditto.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Don't know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Don't know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 906.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

No. 701.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Not of his knowledge. See separate letter. H. M. Chase.

No. 891.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 804.

Letter accompanied this saying not to his knowledge. H. M. Chase.

No. 987.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 329.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. None that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 706.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. By reputation.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 1100.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; has opposed it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1086.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1062.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8 Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 983.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 96.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from heresay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 607.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 867.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. None has come to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I haven't heard that he was.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1049.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge, and not from hearsay, whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. In my opinion, he did not.
If so, in what particular?—A. I think he was as loyal to the service as any man connected with it.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I held conversation with Mr. Quackenbush on several occasions just previous to his removal from the service, and he never mentioned the American Federation of Labor in his remarks nor expressed any opinion whatever on the subject.
9. Has he ever urged you, or have you ever heard him urge anyone else, to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 791.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge, and not from hearsay, whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No, sir.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not remember the exact words, but I have overheard him express an opinion adverse to joining such a body.
9. Has he ever urged you, or have you ever heard him urge anyone else, to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 655.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I only know Mr. Quackenbush by sight, having met him only twice, and then in a public manner, and am therefore unable to give the information desired. We have never met on duty or at the terminus, as his tour of duty brought him to Boston on the day when I was at the further end of my run.

No. 855.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not believe he did; I never heard him speak ill of the service or any of its officials. I have known him long and always regarded him as a high-minded gentleman.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Never to my knowledge.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I never knew him to be an agitator or heard of his being such.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I never knew of his doing so or heard of it.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I have no knowledge of his doing so and never heard anyone say he did.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He never has.

No. 533.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not think so; no.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 554.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; quite the contrary.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 131.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 411.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not in the least.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1060.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 359.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I never heard of the man until his name was mentioned for president, and then only in a way that would not cause any trouble between the department and clerks.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I do not think so.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I can not answer intelligently.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I have never been approached by him, and know nothing of such an action on his part.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not believe so, as such an action would be condemned; I personally would not countenance such an act.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 614.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never knew of it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No, sir.

No. 954.

2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your divison?—A. I never knew there was such a man in the Railway Mail Service until after he had been removed from the service; neither did I hear or know that any clerk was causing any disturbance in the service.

No. 556.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Have never seen him and never saw any communication signed, or purporting to be signed, by him which would foment discord of any kind reasonably.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No; except that his running for president has seemed to arouse the animosity of A. E. Walton and following.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I ever heard of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I ever heard of. He indorsed, so I have heard, some resolutions of some sort—whether hostile to officials I do not know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I ever heard of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Do not know of any such policy in this division. Nothing that he or anyone else in this division has written in favor of such a policy has ever reached me.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No one but Senator La Follette has ever written me on this subject, and no person whatever has urged me to join such an organization. I received a circular from the A. F. of L., but did not read it.

No. 143.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not in my presence.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1069.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Never knew of it.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I never heard of it or knew of it.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Can not say.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 377.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 522.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 256.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I don't know; he never did to me.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 259.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No; has been conservative.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; was opposed to it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 570.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 961.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I do not connect with him on the road and have not seen him or heard him talk in over three years.

No. 818.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Do not know; have never heard of his doing so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 350.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not in my opinion.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I believe he has been opposed to it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1054.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes; personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 962.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I have never heard of any.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I think not, and it seems to be the opinion of any clerks that I have heard express an opinion that he was sincere in his statement against the A. F. of L.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge any one else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1011.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 662.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Don't know.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Don't know.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Don't know.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Don't know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Don't know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Don't know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1045.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Do not know.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Have never heard so.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Have never heard so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1028.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor orgainzation should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 33.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 317.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to the best of my knowledge and belief.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No; not to the best of my knowledge and belief.

50747—S. Doc. 866, 62-2——7

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No; not to the best of my knowledge and belief.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of or ever heard of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to me; and I never heard that he did to anyone.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 733.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have not seen Mr. Quackenbush to talk to in five years.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division—A. No.

No. 366.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I think not.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 198.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Don't know, but think not.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 326.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 246.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 92.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Decidedly not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 268.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. He has not.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 485.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I know nothing of the gentleman in question or of what he may have said or done.

No. 498.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Has not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 375.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 920.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 78.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have no knowledge in the case.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I don't know.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not known.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9 Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has not, neither have I heard him talk about the matter.

No. 463.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 709.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 778.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 767.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 132.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; he opposed forming a union.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 477.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 484.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1033.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 245.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE, FIRST DIVISION,
May 26, 1911.

HERBERT M. CHASE, *Boston, Mass.*

DEAR SIR: It was my pleasure last March or April, when Mr. Charles Quackenbush was in Portland, to be present and hear him speak in support of his candidacy for president of the First Division of the Railway Mail Association.

At that time I approached Mr. Quackenbush and asked him what his attitude was toward the American Federation of Labor. His reply, "I am of the opinion that while in a few instances such a move would be of some benefit to the association I think that the very best thing we can do is to keep out of it."

If the above information will be of any use to you, you have my full permission to use my name in connection with it.

Yours, for success,

ROY A. SYLVESTER,
Railway Postal Clerk, Bath and Lewiston Railway Post Office.

No. 595.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1081.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in you opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. He has advised against it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 866.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 455.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Never.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 362.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 299.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. None that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never heard of his advocacy of such.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 623.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not, but has always advised the clerks otherwise.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Never.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; he was never in sympathy with the movement.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—No.

No. 507.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4–9.—A. Have no knowledge that he did any of these things.

No. 190.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 831.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 663.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 159.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 995.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 925.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

No. 218.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No. (Writer stated in attached letter that he never heard anything about Quackenbush in any way.)
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 654.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Do not know.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Do not know.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Do not know.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Do not know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Do not know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has not asked me.

No. 203.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Have never heard of such.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insurbordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Positively no.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 768.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. No; resignation May 8, 1911.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1052.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 141.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. (Not of his knowledge. Separate letter.—H. M. Chase.)
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 196.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 387.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Same as above.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Ditto.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of and never heard so.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 686.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Know nothing.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Have no personal knowledge of such act.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Ditto.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 596.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 896.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 5.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—Yes, I am; for 50 years.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I don't think he has.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I don't think so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 183.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 181.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a celrk in your division?—A. Slightly.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 139.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Have always heard him spoken of as a good clerk and good companion.

No. 816.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 95.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 454.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; quite the contrary.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 657.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 551.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department? –A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 281.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Nothing I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Certainly he has not to me.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 524.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I do not know of anyone who has misrepresented the service, its conditions, or officers.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 897.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Do not believe he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No, not to the best of my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I ever heard of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. If he did, I never heard of it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 633.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I never heard so.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I never heard so.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I never heard so.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I don't know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 401.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 263.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Very slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 959.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No; not to the detriment of the service.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

I believe that Mr. Quackenbush has been misrepresented to the department by people who wish to further their own plans.

No. 760.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I was until April 19, 1911.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes; well.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Positively no.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No; a quieting element.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No; his policies and ideas were all for a better service.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No; his efforts have been against that class.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; opposed it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No; also heard him oppose this move.

No. 515.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. By sight.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I never heard him or heard of him doing so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 414.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. From my knowledge, he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor.—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 62.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Never heard it said so.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Don't know.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Don't know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Don't know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 222.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I do not know that he has.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Same.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Same as above.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Same.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Same.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 83.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have no knowledge of it.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 537.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know that he has.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 539.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; he has always advised against it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 948.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 573.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 885.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1038.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 696.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Only by sight.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 745.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 150.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Ditto as No. 3.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Ditto.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Ditto.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Ditto.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Ditto.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 819.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 180.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I am aware of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No; not that I have heard of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 1097.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. To the best of my knowledge and belief he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be established in this division?—A. No.

No. 144.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 108.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Same.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Same.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Same.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Same.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 516.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. None to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No, not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. None to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No, not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1012.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have seen no indications that he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I do not think he has.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 478.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never heard of any.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I am aware.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Never heard any clerk in conversation state that he had.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Never heard of the slightest word or act.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 300.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 822.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 886.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 839.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No; he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 443.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Do not know.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Do not know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Do not know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 656.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 694.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

I have never met Mr. Quackenbush but once, and then only for about 5 minutes.

No. 386.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 544.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Unable to state.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Never knew of it.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Not to my knowledge.

No. 449.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 244.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service? —A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks. —A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; on the contrary deemed it unwise.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1025.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 177.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affilitaion of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never heard him say anything regarding it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 993.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 93.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 644.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 136.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. As far as I know; no.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 437.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I have never heard him.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I have never heard him.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 187.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 416.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not think so.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 903.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 716.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else so join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 494.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I do not know that he has.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 367.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Positively, no.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 114.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1004.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I do not think so.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 154.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. My opinion is that he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Indeed not.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge any one else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Emphatically, no.

No. 520.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 718.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Do not know that he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 100.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I think not.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No; not so far as I have ever seen or heard.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I am aware of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I never knew or heard of his doing so.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I never heard nor knew of his doing so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No, sir.

No. 726.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Only know him by sight.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have no knowledge of his making any discontent among the clerks.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 476.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 817.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, fromerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; he informed me that he did not think it advisable.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 504.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Don't know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 588.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. None at all.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 676.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has be been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 302.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No. I have always considered him a very conservative and level-headed man, as he ran with me on B. S. & N. Y. R. P. O.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. In conversation with him he stated to me that he was not in favor of such affiliation.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 534.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. He has not.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 873.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; he has opposed it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 591.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Decidedly no; he discouraged such sentiments.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 219.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 559.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 260.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; not from knowledge or hearsay either.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 845.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 10.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
I have never met Mr. Quackenbush. I do not know him.

No. 51.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 32.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. He has not.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1042.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have never heard of him doing so.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 821.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1053.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 115.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 116.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1018.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Never heard he did.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never heard he did.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 535.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 989.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insurbordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 803.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Never to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Never to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. His letter of announcement of his candidacy for president of the Railway Mail Association was against rather than for affiliation.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 400.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 373.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 19.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am not.

No. 210.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not with me.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 894.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I think not.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I don't know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 597.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 164.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Have never heard so.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I was aware of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. In his statement while candidate for president of Railway Mail Association he states he is convinced that it would be a very unwise step to affiliate with the American Federation of Labor.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 46.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have not.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Can not say.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Can not say.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Can not say.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 568.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Have no knowledge of any such action.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 277.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Very well.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He never has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No; positively no.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Never.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. I refer to his first circular issued.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 237.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in you opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. He is just the opposite.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 953.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No; I saw him once at a meeting, but never spoke to him.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not know of any.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 234.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No; not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 499.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not know that he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Same as above.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Same as above.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Same as above.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 798.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I received a circular from him opposing it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 34.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 901.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never in my presence.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 673.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 288.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 512.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 97.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 285.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge in any way.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 354.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Have never met him.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge, and in a communication he sent me, he opposed such affiliation.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Not to my knowledge, and I have always understood that he was opposed to such an organization.

No. 250.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. —.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 622.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not think that he is guilty of these charges.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not in my presence or to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not in my presence or to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 922.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 851.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 890.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Decidedly not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I am aware of.
7. Has he at any time incited insurbordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I am aware of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I am aware of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 187–R.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No, sir.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Never to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Never heard of such.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No, sir.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I ever heard of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No, sir; to the contrary, has said he thought it not advisable.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 1.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never talked with him personally.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 168.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 952.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I have never heard of any such indorsement.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I don't know. Not to me, at any rate.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 581.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 243.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 251.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. From hearsay would say he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No, as far as I have heard.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No, as far as I have heard.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No, as far as I have heard.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No, as far as I have heard.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 749.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 703.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I do not know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1085.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1088.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 410.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. He has not.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 161.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 292.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Have met him.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not know.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I do not know.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I do not know.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. I have no knowledge of it.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I do not know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No. Have not seen him for several years.

No. 294.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 565.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 509.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 352.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service.—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never heard him speak on the subject.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Never heard his views on the matter at all.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Never to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I never heard him speak for or against the American Federation of Labor.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 305.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 631.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 130.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 881.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3–7. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not having met Mr. Quackenbush for several years my answer to these questions is in the negative.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. Not to my knowledge.

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 16.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.

2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Very little.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I think not.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 672.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.

2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. In my opinion he has not.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. On the contrary, he came out in a circular letter opposing it.

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 286.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.

2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; on the contrary he advised against it.

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 50.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not as I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not as I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not as I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not as I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 284.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 833.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not to me, nor have I ever heard that he has to others.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. He has not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge any one else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 434.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 31.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Never heard of such a thing until after his removal.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; has been against it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 18.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No; he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 470.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 600.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I have never known him to do so.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I have never known him to do so.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I have never known him to do so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 405.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Have never heard him make such a statement.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 351.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 82.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. This question is surprising. I do not know of any discontent caused by him.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I have never heard him say a word against the policies or administrative acts of the department.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; on the contrary, his circular and notice in the Railway Post Office previous to election advised the clerks of the first division against affiliating with the federation of labor; he advised clerks to support their own organization.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No; and I never heard him refer to a labor organization of any kind.

No. 628.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not that I am aware of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. —.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not think so.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Never heard so before his removal.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I am aware of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not that I am aware of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I do not think so.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I am aware of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 230.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, is conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I am aware.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 102.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I do not know.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I do not believe so.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I think not.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 383.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not think he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in the division?—A. No.

No. 620.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. So far as I know, only as to the election of division president. The defeated candidate probably thought him such.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Not that I remember of, in any letter or circular letter ever read by me as being edited by him. Have never seen the man or heard him speak.

No. 450.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not think so.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not that I am aware of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 604.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I know of nothing of the kind.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not think so; not to me, certainly.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 746.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know anything about.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never heard that he did.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 501.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No; not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I don't know whether he has or not; never heard.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 898.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I am aware of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I never heard that he did.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 765.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 293.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I am aware of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. He did not.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 848.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Never.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 584.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Very well.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No; he has advised me against it.

No. 118.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Have never heard of any.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. I can't say.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I can't say.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I don't know; have never heard he had.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I don't know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 459.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge and belief.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 813.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Never heard of him doing so.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 209.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never, to my knowledge.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 892.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; believe he did not favor it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 580.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 192.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Yes; in that he was fighting against Mr. Walton.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to me.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 576.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 394.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 121.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railwav Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Has made the statement to me (before his removal) that there was nothing in his opinion to warrant the affiliation of the railway postal clerks with the American Federation of Labor or any benefit to be derived for such action.

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Not to my knowledge.

No. 870.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. He has not.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No; on the contrary, he has vigorously opposed.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 462.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No. I received a letter from him prior to his election as president First Division Railway Mail Association soliciting my vote, but it was not at all inflammatory. In fact, I was surprised at its "tameness."
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge. Most of us realize that rules in any field of endeavor are necessary for proper administration, and when these rules become too obnoxious the proper thing is get another job. The new man won't "stick."
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. The only intimation I have that such affiliation was contemplated is a circular letter which I received several months ago from one of the American Federation of Labor national organizers. The clerks with whom I come into contact with while very much dissatisfied with the "take up the slack" order, always felt that the Railway Mail Association could handle the situation if given time and cooperation by the membership.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No; it would avail him nothing to do so in my territory. Most of us feel that as the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen have affected their reforms without outside aid, we should also be able to do so or quit the Railway Mail Service.

No. 152.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 809.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I met him on the street within a week after the first meeting and he told me positively he was against such affiliation.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 613.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1051.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not think so.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 810.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have seen Mr. Quackenbush and talked with him a great deal and never have I heard him say one word that would cause any discontent among his fellow clerks.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 388.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Officially.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I believe not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I think not.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 978.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 759.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not know.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I believe not.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 585.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Very slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Personally I do not know.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I do not know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No; I have not.

No. 54.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 621.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 721.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not knowing him personally I can only say that I have always heard nothing but praise of him as a railroad postal clerk and as a man.

No. 608.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at anytime incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I am aware of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge; on the other hand he has spoken against it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1067.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I don't think so. Never heard him say anything unreasonable or unwarranted, and have heard him talk a great deal.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I don't think so.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. On the contrary he has advised against affiliating with the American Federation of Labor.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Not to my knowledge. His idea, as I have heard him express it, is to better conditions through our own organization, and we all know that conditions can be improved.

No. 381.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I never knew of his doing anything of the sort.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 193.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has not, neither have I heard him urge anyone else.

No. 76.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never heard anything of this nature from or of him.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I understood he was positively against this, a fact that gave him the confidence of many.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 460.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Of all the times that I met Mr. Quackenbush I never heard him make any statement that would cause any discontent among the clerks.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. He has not, to the best of my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. He has not.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Never to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I never heard him speak upon this question.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 271.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 107.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1057.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 562.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I never heard that he did.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 135.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 137.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Have never known him to do anything of this kind.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 464.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never, to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. In fact, I have heard him state we should not join this organization, but should present our grievances to the Post Office Department through the Railway Mail Association.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 283.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 528.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 598.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks—A. Not to my knowledge.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 566.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. From my own knowledge, the only discontent fomented by Mr. Quackenbush was to Mr. A. C. Walton and a few of his trusty lieutenants who knew that Quackenbush was to be elected president of the first division, Railway Mail Association.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. Have been amongst the clerks of the numerous railroad offices in the first division and had never heard Mr. Quackenbush's name mentioned in any way with the American Federation of Labor.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 77.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not know.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division.—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I don't know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I don't know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I don't know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 346.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 491.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 986.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 253.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay, whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 510.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge, and not from hearsay, whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you, or have you ever heard him urge anyone else, to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 15.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge, and not from hearsay, whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; none whatever.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you, or have you ever heard him urge anyone else, to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 7.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge, and not from hearsay, whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you, or have you ever heard him urge anyone else, to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 80.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you, or have you ever heard him urge anyone else, to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 824.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 895.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 808.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 361.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; never heard of any.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 372.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge and not from hearsay either.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its condition and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 643.

Am not a member of the association and never saw or heard of the man in question until his removal.

No. 675.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I do not think so.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 390.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not know that he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Can not say that he has.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. I know of no instance where he has.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. If he has the reports of such acts have never reached me.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 457.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No. Have associated considerably with Mr. Quackenbush and have never seen or heard anything that would substantiate the above charges.

No. 587.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have not heard that he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I have not heard of such.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 505.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 231.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. He has not.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has not, nor have I heard him urge anyone else.

No. 871.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I have no knowledge of him doing so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 472.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks. A. I have every reason to believe he did not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I have ever heard of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 348.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 26.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—sion?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 617.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 371.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. No.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I have never heard him make any statement.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. He has not.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. He has not.
7. Has he at any time invited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. He has not.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. He has not.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has not.

No. 838.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Never to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Never to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Never to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Never to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never. I have heard him state positively that he was not in favor of affiliating with the American Federation of Labor.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Not to my knowledge.

No. 480.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division Railway May Service?—Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. I have no knowledge of such.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 998.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its contions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 306.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I have not met Mr. Quackenbush since the present conditions started, and have had no conversation with him; have seen nothing in communications from him in any way warranting the charges enumerated above.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. He opposed it in the one and only communication I have seen from him on that subject.

No. 156.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, jormerly a clerk in you division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. I certainly do not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator again the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I have no information that he has.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never has mentioned it to me or so intimated. I am not or ever will favor affiliation.

No. 1098.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 28.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 325.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Never heard that he did.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know about.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 42.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 702.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. ——.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. He stated to me that he was opposed to such action.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 793.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

No. 186.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 786.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 990.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 1055.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. His printed statement advised us not to affiliate.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 919.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 147.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. He has not.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Yes. He was opposed to the gag rule.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Positively no.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. He has not.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. He has not.

No. 737.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not that I know of.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I ever heard of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 221.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge, and judge to the contrary.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not that I know or ever heard of.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I ever heard of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. Never.

No. 497.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.

No. 724.

Have no knowledge whatever of Mr. Quackenbush or of his acts.

No. 1034.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 182.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. I am.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Decidedly no.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 227.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 669.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 715.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge, and not from heresay, whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 764.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinton Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 313.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No; he has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 296.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Have not heard of any.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not as far as I know.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not heard of any.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Could not say.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Never heard so.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No, sir.

No. 323.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his follow clerks?—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Do not think so.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. He claimed to be very much opposed to it.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 481.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 111.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 176.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. A little.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 563.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not believe he has according to the best of my knowledge and belief. Mr. Quackenbush was elected president of the first division Railway Mail Association on account of a growing dissatisfaction with his predecessor, and not on account of any policy advocated by him.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. That I do not know; I have never heard his name mentioned in this connection.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 728.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 527.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. I think his statement in the announcement of his candidacy for president of first division, Railway Mail Service, answers that.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 860.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not as I know.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 649.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whrther or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. None.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 389.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I do not know that he has.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not that I know of.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not that I know of.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not that I know of.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 341.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Have not heard of such.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one b organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 309.

Stated in letter he did not know Quackenbush.

H. M. Chase.

No. 785.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organize in this division?—A. No.

No. 636.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, a formerly clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 586.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—No.

No. 511.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Slightly.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. Yes. Circular announcing candidacy for president, First Division Railway Mail Association, especially words "opposed to gag rule."
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

Being but slightly acquainted with Mr. Quackenbush, I can answer only 1, 2, 3, and 9 positively. Other clerks speak highly of him both as a railway postal clerk and a gentleman.

No. 420.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.

3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No knowledge of any such indorsement.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 589.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 680.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 529.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He did not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 105.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 736.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. I do not know.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 241.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 202.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 103.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Not personally.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not of my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not of my personal knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. I don't know.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. I don't know.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 684.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division.—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not, in your opinion, Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 8.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. No.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

No. 685.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. I am.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. He has not. I have heard him advise against anything of that nature more than once.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. No.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers?—A. No.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. No, sir.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. No. He did advise, in my hearing, on more than one occasion, just the reverse.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. I have not. I have heard him advise against it.

No. 213.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. No.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. I have seen no evidence.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. Not to my knowledge.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. Not to my knowledge.
7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division.—A. No.

No. 264.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service?—A. Yes.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division?—A. Yes.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks.—A. Not to my knowledge.
4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division?—A. No.
5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department?—A. Not to my knowledge.
6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions and its officers?—A. I know of no occasion.

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks?—A. Not to my knowledge.
8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor?—A. Not to my knowledge.
9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division?—A. No.

DEPOSITION OF CHARLES H. QUACKENBUSH, FORMERLY A CLERK IN THE FIRST DIVISION, RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Now comes Charles H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., and being sworn on oath deposes and says:

That he is Charles H. Quackenbush, residing at Stamford, in the State of Connecticut. That he is a married man and has a wife and family and has resided in Stamford, Conn., for about the past 10 years. That your deponent formerly resided in New Haven, Conn., and to day enjoys an enviable reputation among his fellow citizens, both in New Haven and Stamford as is more particularly shown by the letters which are hereto appended and marked "Exhibits A1, A2, A3."

That up to the month of March, 1911, and for the past 13 years he was employed in the Railway Mail Service and at the time of his discharge from said service he was clerk in a route between Boston and New York City. That on April 5, 1911, he received notice from the Washington post-office headquarters that he was discharged. That the only reason for said discharge given at that time was "for conduct detrimental to the service." That at the time of his discharge your deponent enjoyed an enviable reputation among his fellow clerks and with his superior officers, as is shown by petition for reinstatement signed by several hundred clerks, as more particularly set forth and marked as "Exhibit B," the body of said petition being as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *April 6, 1911.*

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned railway postal clerks in the first division, respectfully urge that you reconsider the order of March 31 removing from our number Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush, a brother clerk, for whom we have the highest regard and who we feel sure could absolve himself from any charges of conduct detrimental to the service upon a hearing to that point.

(Signed by several hundred clerks.)

That your deponent's standing with his officers immediately over him has been a source of very great satisfaction to your deponent. The good opinion of him held by his immediate officers being shown by statement signed by them and marked "Exhibit C."

That there are certain facts and dates not directly connected with the Railway Mail Service which are in his opinion significant as bearing indirectly upon his discharge from this service, to wit: In March, 1911, he announced himself as candidate for the office of president of the First Division Railway Mail Association, said first division being one of 13 divisions of the parent organization known as the Railway Mail Association, which has 13 branches covering the entire United States, said first division covering geographically the whole of the New England States. At the time your deponent announced his candidacy, A. C. Walton was and had been for a few years past

president of said division. That the date set for the annual meeting of the first division for the election of officers for the ensuing year, etc., was April 11, 1911. The method of conducting the election was by sending out printed ballots sometime about two weeks in advance of the election with instructions for the men to send same by return mail marked and in sealed envelope to be opened on the day of the annual meeting. That on April 10, 1911, your deponent received a letter, copy of which is set forth as Exhibit D, signed by the secretary of the national association, namely, the Railway Mail Association, notifying your deponent that the executive committee of the national association had ordered his membership canceled in the same. That one must be a member in good standing in the national association to be a member in good standing in any of the division associations. That this notice was received by your deponent at the day before the date set for the annual meeting of the first division. Your deponent points out the fact that if his membership had been legally canceled he could be denied the right to attend the annual meeting of the first division on the following day, namely, April 11, and the election to any office could be denied him. That your deponent was advised that there was no provision in the constitution, by-laws, or the charter of the national association which allowed its executive committee to cancel his membership, and furthermore was advised and believed that no executive committee meeting had been held in which the canceling of his membership had been considered. He has since been informed that no executive committee meeting had been held and that without the authority of any article in the constitution, by-laws, or charter of the national association or the first division association, his rival for the office of president, Mr. A. C. Walton, he being a member of the executive committee of the national association, ex officio, had ordered the secretary of the national association to notify your deponent that his membership had been canceled. Your deponent sets forth a copy of an affidavit received from the secretary of the national association that such was the case and has marked the same "Exhibit E." Your deponent therefore points out that A. C. Walton, his rival for the office of president, without authority and summarily, had canceled your deponent's membership in the first division for the purpose of defeating his election of April 11, 1911, for the office of president of the first division association. Your deponent further says that acting under advice he brought a bill in equity and enjoined said Walton and the then secretary of the first division association from interfering with any of your deponent's rights as a member of the first division association, and in particular from interfering with his election to the office of president should the members of the association so elect him. This injunction was granted. The case was tried on the merits before the election. The annual meeting was held on April 11, 1911, the ballots opened and counted, and your deponent duly declared elected by a vote of about 550 to 320, and has assumed the office of president of the first division and has held that office to date. That the following morning there appeared in the Boston Post a statement made by Walton to the effect that he could and would cause the dismissal from the service of those clerks who had opposed his election, and an exact copy of the article which purports to be an interview by the Post reporter with said Walton is hereto appended and marked "Exhibit F."

That your deponent made careful inquiry of his immediate superintendent and of the chief inspector in charge over him to find out for what reason he was discharged from said service, and was informed by both said officials that they did not know any reason. That your deponent offers the foregoing facts with regard to his election as president of the First Division Railway Mail Association to show the action that said Walton took so that he might prevent the election of your deponent to said office, together with the entire absence of any knowledge of your deponent's immediate superiors as to the reasons why he was discharged from said service, and asks that the inference be drawn that the source of the information upon which the department at Washington could possibly have acted might possibly have been A. C. Walton or those persons through whom he wished to work so as to cover himself.

That your deponent has taken measures looking toward his reinstatement in said service and with counsel visited the headquarters at Washington on May 8, 9, 10, and 11, 1911, for the purpose of ascertaining the charges against him and being allowed to meet the same. That your deponent had a hearing before the Hon. Joseph Stewart, Second Assistant Postmaster General, on May 11, 1911, and there learned for the first time that he had been charged with conduct tending toward arousing insubordination among his fellow clerks and had been guilty of acts which tended to breed discontent and dissatisfaction among his fellow clerks. This charge was made orally, and the department absolutely refused to furnish a bill of particulars specifying what were the particular acts of your deponent, if any, which made the basis of the department's charges. Your deponent notes that he is charged by Gen. Stewart before the civil-service rules committee with the following written charges, namely:

> Clerk Quackenbush was removed from the service for fomenting unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks; for being a disturbing element among them, and an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department; for indorsing the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers; and for inciting insubordination.

Said statement being printed on page 86, of H. R. 5970. That at the time of the hearing before Gen. Stewart on May 11, 1911, no specific charges being made, your deponent explained his conduct with reference to every matter that had been considered by the first division association or by Mr. Quackenbush personally during the past few months with reference to the relations between said first division or your deponent and the post-office authorities, and at the request of Gen. Stewart your deponent now states his position with reference to the following matters:

(1) Affiliation with the American Federation of Labor on the part of the clerks of the first division.

(2) The so-called resolution of February 12.

(3) The so-called Slocum resolution of March 12.

(4) The relations with the Harpoon.

Your deponent says that with reference to (1) the affiliation with the American Federation of Labor that on February 26, 1911, he attended a meeting in Boston which was addressed by a Mr. McCarthy, who represented the American Federation of Labor. That there were about 25 railway mail clerks present. That the meeting had been called by Mr. McCarthy and as far as your deponent knew was

not called by Mr. McCarthy at the request of any railway mail clerk. That your deponent did not ask Mr. McCarthy or anyone connected with the American Federation of Labor to address the railway mail clerks. That your deponent had absolutely nothing to do in any way, shape, or manner with the holding of this meeting. That your deponent did not urge or ask a single solitary clerk to attend that meeting. That your deponent did not know that the meeting was to be held until he had reached Boston the day of the holding of the meeting and had seen a notice of said meeting posted. That your deponent attended the meeting without any knowledge of what was going to be said or done and without intending to take any active part whatever. That your deponent had not intended prior to the holding of the meeting to join a labor organization and had not made up his mind whether it would be advantageous for him and other railway mail clerks to join a labor union. Your deponent points out in this connection that the first division association is the only association, or almost the only association, in the United States which has not at the present time a labor organization among the railway mail clerks. Your deponent further says that at the time of holding of this meeting there was no general demand on the part of the clerks of the first division for organizing any such labor union. That at the time of holding this meeting your deponent believes that the clerks in this first division had not in any large numbers made up their minds one way or the other as to the advantage or disadvantage of joining any labor organization. That at the meeting your deponent took no conspicuous part. That after the labor agitator had addressed the meeting the different members began to offer questions. That there was more or less confusion and that some one sitting near your deponent asked him if he would bring order out of chaos and have the clerks address their questions through him. This your deponent did and took no part in the discussion one way or the other.

When the question came up as to whether there should be a labor organization formed and motion was made to lay the matter over for two weeks while the clerks got together and gave the matter further attention, the motion to postpone was passed by a vote of about 14 to 11. Your deponent calls attention to the fact that only 7 clerks were needed to organize a union and that the 11 who voted against postponing the matter could have easily organized a union at that time, but that the 11 clerks who so voted were guided by the advice and by a consideration for the wishes of the other 14, and that a union was not organized at that time; and your deponent further says that the subject has not been considered since that time. Your deponent further says that since that time there has not been any agitation along this line. Your deponent further says that his position was definitely stated as directly opposed to affiliation with the American Federation of Labor in his circular letter to the clerks of the first division, dated March 16, 1911, in which letter he announced his candidacy for the office of president. This was 15 days prior to his removal from the service. That this letter is hereto appended and marked "Exhibit G." Your deponent further offers as proof of his position regarding labor organizations the affidavit of Henry Banchaud, hereto annexed, marked "Exhibit H." Also by letter of Stoddard, secretary of the first division, and marked "Exhibit I."

Your deponent says with regard to (2) the so-called resolutions of February 12, 1911, which are set forth in full and marked "Exhibit J," that these resolutions were brought into the meeting February 12 by a committee which consisted of about 15 men. That your deponent was a member of this committee. That your deponent was not chairman of this committee, nor did your deponent move that a committee on resolutions be appointed to retire. Your deponent says that he did not go to the meeting of February 12 nor did he retire with this committee with a single one of the resolutions in his mind. That he did not frame up or contribute a single one of these resolutions. That he did not know at the time he went to the meeting of February 12 or retired with the committee that the committee would report a single one of the resolutions or that a single one of the resolutions were to be discussed. That the resolutions were reported at the meeting and were adopted unanimously. Your deponent says that after these resolutions were passed various motions were passed bearing on the question as to what should be done with them, and that your deponent moved that a copy be sent to the Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General, general superintendent, the chairman of the Post Office Committee, and to the Railway Post Office.

Your deponent says with regard to (3) the so-called Slocum resolutions that his position was as follows: That on March 12, 1911, at a meeting of the railway mail clerks there was present, among others, a Mr. Slocum, a former clerk in the Railway Mail Service, who had been discharged "for the good of the service." That your deponent, with others, did not know the reason why Slocum had been discharged. That your deponent at that time was only very slightly acquainted with Slocum. That at the meeting Mr. Slocum had with him certain resolutions which he was anxious to have presented; that he asked your deponent if he would offer the same, and that your deponent told him distinctly that he would not offer the same, nor would he vote for them, nor did he approve of them, but that he, your deponent, would offer resolutions which he could conscientiously approve of. That your deponent offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That whereas the general superintendent has summarily removed from the service Harry E. Slocum, we feel that in order that we, as clerks, may conduct ourselves in a manner wholly acceptable to the department that the reasons for the dismissal of this clerk be given publicity.

That this resolution was seconded and adopted. That Mr. Slocum then took the floor and read the following resolution:

Whereas one of our members has been removed from the service; and
Whereas no charges were brought, no defense allowed, and appeal is not granted; and
Whereas said member claims he is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service: Be it therefore
Resolved, That we, members of the First Division Railway Mail Association, do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officials, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought.

That the clerk pro tempore immediately entered after this resolution the following as a part of the minutes, a copy of which reached the Post Office headquarters at Washington before the records had been read and approved in any subsequent meeting, as follows:

Mr. Quackenbush withdrew his resolution in favor of the one just offered by Mr. Slocum.

Your deponent says the above is not correct.

That your deponent says that on May 21, 1911, at a duly called meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association the records of the meeting of March 12 were read for the first time for approval. That it was then found and pointed out that the clerk pro tempore had written the records regarding your deponent's withdrawing his resolution in favor of Slocum incorrectly and did not state what had really occurred. After careful deliberation the minutes of the meeting were changed in accordance with what was understood to be the facts, and the clerk pro tempore of the March 12 meeting stated that he approved of the change.

That the correct minutes are as follows:

President asked Mr. Quackenbush if he would withdraw his resolution. He (Quackenbush) said yes, if the meeting so desired, or words to that effect.

And your deponent further says that a copy of the records of the meeting of March 12 as corrected by the meeting of May 21, 1911, is shown by the letter of secretary of the first division which is hereto appended and marked "Exhibit K." And your deponent denies that he offered his resolution regarding Slocum in the meeting of March 12 with any intention to pave the way, as has been suggested, for Slocum's own resolution. Your deponent denies that he was in any way in collusion with Slocum, and your deponent specifically states that in offering his resolution regarding Slocum he was actuated only by a desire to know wherein Slocum had erred, and, further, for the purpose of heading off a substitute resolution which Slocum was going to offer himself. That your deponent to confirm this fact offers the affidavit of a clerk in the Railway Mail Service as set forth hereinafter and marked "Exhibit L."

And your deponent further says with regard to (4) the Harpoon that he has never indorsed or approved of the Harpoon. That he has never contributed a single article to the same. That he has subscribed to the same himself but has never solicited the subscriptions of any others. That while he is charged with having solicited subscriptions for the Harpoon the facts are these: That when he was about to send in his $1 for his own subscription to the Harpoon he stated that fact before the other members of his crew on the train and that certain of the clerks sent in their subscriptions together, thereby taking advantage of the Harpoon's offer of seven subscriptions for the price of five. That on this occasion your deponent did not urge the others to send in their subscriptions nor did he recommend that they do so or advise them in any way. That your deponent has publicly denounced the idea of making the Harpoon the association medium and has proof of the same by calling attention to the following in his announcement of March 9, 1911, which is appended hereto and marked "Exhibit M."

As further proof your deponent offers affidavit of Henry Branchaud appended hereto and marked "Exhibit H."

And your deponent further says that it developed at the hearing before Gen. Stewart on May 11, 1911, that he had been represented as being a leader in stirring up discontent and had been a principal factor in creating a spirit of insubordination among the clerks. That at said hearing your deponent offered evidence to show that such was not the case. Your deponent offered evidence to show that whatever dissatisfaction and discontent existed or had existed among the clerks

in the first division was caused solely by the issuance of certain recent orders from headquarters regarding the service conditions, and that said discontent and dissatisfaction, if any existed or had existed, was caused wholly by said orders and was not the result of the agitation or efforts of any leader or agitator. That your deponent offered to submit further proof that he had not been a leader or an agitator or a principal factor in causing discontent or dissatisfaction or insubordination among the clerks, and submits herewith a statement signed by the principal officers of the first division, Railway Mail Service, that such was not the case, as follows:

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, being supervisory officials of the first division, Railway Mail Service, and former associates of Mr. Charles H. Quakenbush in this service, understanding that it is your wish to have an expression from us as to the conduct of Mr. Quackenbush while in this service, beg to respectfully state that to the best of our knowledge he has always conducted himself in a gentlemanly and orderly manner and has not been a trouble maker or an originator of strife and discontent among his fellow clerks.

Signed by Edw. J. Ryan, superintendent Railway Mail Service; C. H. Collins, chief clerk, Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office; E. P. Jewett, late chief clerk, Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office; Edward F. Goggin, clerk in charge, Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office; R. J. Gorman, clerk in charge, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; F. W. Merten, clerk in charge, Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office.

Copy of which is hereto annexed and marked "Exhibit C."

And your deponent offers for further proof a petition which was presented to the clerks at their meeting on May 21, 1911, and signed by all or nearly all of the clerks present, and hereinafter set forth and marked "Exhibit N." Also a letter of a fellow clerk, John E. Brennan, and marked "Exhibit O."

For further proof, and at the suggestion of the honorable Second Assistant Postmaster General, in order to ascertain the correctness of the charges brought against your deponent, the latter, through his counsel, addressed a circular letter to each member of the First Division Railway Mail Association, some 1,050 in number, and is receiving replies on each mail as the deposition is being prepared, and has received to date about 500 replies, and all of which are submitted with this deposition, and all of which without a single exception your deponent maintains entirely exonerates him from the charges preferred.

And your deponent further states that in all his efforts to date looking toward his reinstatement in said service he has worked entirely through the heads of his department, has solicited his Congressmen to ask the department for a hearing after his dismissal, and has used no means whatever to embarrass the department in any way whatever, but has been as anxious to correct misrepresentations concerning the conditions in the said first division as concerning your deponent's own true position.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES H. QUACKENBUSH.

CITY OF WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 1, 1911.*

Then personally appeared Charles H. Quackenbush and took oath that he had read the foregoing deposition and that the statements contained therein are true in each and every particular.

Before me—

[SEAL.] EUSTACE C. OWEN,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT A.

STAMFORD, CONN., *May 31, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Mr. C. H. Quackenbush tells me that he is shortly to appear before you to answer to charges against him as a railway postal clerk.

Regarding his conduct as such I, of course, have no knowledge; but I have known him personally for about 10 years, and I wish to say to you that as a man of high character and ability he has my utmost respect, and I beg you to carefully weigh any evidence you may have to the contrary.

Respectfully, yours, WILLIAM H. JONES.

EXHIBIT A1.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *May 29, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I learned that Mr. C. H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., has been dismissed from the Government service. Having known Mr. Quackenbush for more than 15 years and he having been employed as one of our staff of some 25 salesmen, I always found him a reliable worker, straight as a string, of good ability, and absolutely honest. I want to add my testimony to his worth and I hope he will be accorded a hearing for his reinstatement, which I certainly believe he is entitled to. I am,

Yours, very truly,

_____ _____

(Copy sent to H. M. Chase, attorney, as copy of original sent to addressee hereon.)

EXHIBIT A2.

STAMFORD, CONN., *May 31, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I have known Mr. C. H. Quackenbush for more than 10 years, and I esteem him as a man of highest character, and assure you that he has the respect and good will of his fellow citizens to a degree seldom attained by any man, and I confidently expect that a full knowledge on your part of his merit will result in his reinstatement in the service.

Very respectfully, M. W. FLEMMING.

EXHIBIT A3.

THE MERCHANTS' STEAMBOAT LINE (INC.),
Stamford, Conn., May 31, 1911.

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad of this opportunity to testify to the sterling worth of my friend, Mr. C. H. Quackenbush. It is a pleasure to me to get on record in some form of appreciation of his life and character, based on many years of intimate association.

Respectfully,

_____ _____,
Director Merchants Line.

(Handed to Mr. Quackenbush, unsigned, in absence of writer.)

EXHIBIT B.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 6, 1911.*

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, railway postal clerks in the first division, respectfully urge that you reconsider the order of March 31, removing from our number Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush, a brother clerk, for whom we have the highest regard and who, we feel sure, could absolve himself from any charges of conduct detrimental to the service upon a hearing on that point.

EXHIBIT C.

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, being supervisory officials of the first division, Railway Mail Service, and former associates of Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush in this service, understanding that it is your wish to have an expression from us as to the conduct of Mr. Quackenbush while in this service, beg to respectfully state that, to the best of our knowledge, he has always conducted himself in a gentlemanly and orderly manner and has not been a trouble maker or an originator of strife and discontent among his fellow clerks.

EDW. J. RYAN,
Superintendent, Railway Mail Service.
C. H. COLLINS,
Chief Clerk, Boston, Springfield and New York Railway Post Office.
E. P. JEWETT,
Late Chief Clerk, Boston, Springfield and New York.
EDWARD F. GOGGIN,
Clerk in Charge, Boston, Springfield and New York Railway Post Office.
R. J. GORMAN,
Clerk in Charge, Boston, Springfield and New York Railway Post Office.
F. W. MERTEN,
Clerk in Charge, Boston, Springfield and New York Railway Post Office.

EXHIBIT D.

RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Portsmouth, N. H., April 8, 1911.

Mr. C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
Railway Postal Clerk, Springdale, Conn.

MY DEAR SIR: Under instructions from the executive committee of the Railway Mail Association, I am directed to advise you that your membership in the said association has been canceled this day.

I beg to offer to return to you, upon demand, any advance assessments which you may have paid that have not been levied at this time.

Kindly return your certificates in the inclosed envelope.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. A. WOOD, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT E.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
County of Rockingham, ss:

I, George A. Wood, of Portsmouth, State and county aforesaid, being duly sworn depose and say that I am clerk of the Railway Mail Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Hampshire, and that there is on file in the office of the clerk a certain letter, dated April 7, 1911, addressed to me as secretary of the Railway Mail Association of which the following is a true copy:

[First division, Railway Mail Association, comprising the New England States. A. C. Walton, president, 39 Hampstead Road, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; H. R. Stoddard, secretary, room 83 Post Office Building, Boston, Mass.]

APRIL 7, 1911.

Mr. GEO. A. WOOD,
Secretary, Portsmouth, N. H.

SIR: After consulting and talking freely with many members and a committee of members to advise with me, I am firmly of the opinion it is my duty to recommend the removal of Charles H. Quackenbush from the Railway Mail Association and I do so recommend.

A. C. WALTON,
President of First Division Railway Mail Association.

GEORGE A. WOOD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of May, 1911.

[SEAL.] WALTER E. LOONEY,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT F.

[The Boston Post.]

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1911.

OUSTED MAN ELECTED BY MAIL CLERKS—QUACKENBUSH MADE PRESIDENT AFTER BITTER FIGHT.

In the most spirited convention in the history of Division 1, Railway Mail Clerks' Association of New England, held at the South End last night, C. H. Quackenbush, who was recently dismissed from the Government service, was elected president overwhelmingly.

A. C. Walton, of Jamaica Plain, Quackenbush's opponent, refused to recognize an order of the court restraining him from interfering with the election and remained in the chair until he was threatened with arrest for contempt of court.

Quackenbush received 563 votes and his opponent 328 votes.

WILL CONTEST ELECTION.

Walton as he left the hall stated that his opponent's election would be contested by the executive committee of the National Railway Mail Clerks' Association later and all the members who had helped elect him brought to account for their actions.

EXHIBIT G.

STAMFORD, CONN., *March 16, 1911.*

Fellow Members of the Railway Mail Association, attention:

I offer for your careful consideration the following observations, these to be considered as supplementary to my former announcement by circular and by publication in the Railway Post Office.

As many of you have probably surmised, the most important issues of this campaign are not on the surface. Acquaint yourselves with the underlying motives and vote and act accordingly.

That I am in this fight at all is proof that I deem the issue of supreme importance, for in all the years that I have been one of your number I have shown no desire for office of any kind in either of our associations.

Your national association is about to embark on a most important venture, one that I earnestly recommend and expect to work for with all the intelligence and energy I can command. I refer to the proposed establishing of a publicity bureau at Washington, D. C. See to it that the men intrusted with the shaping and guiding of this movement, as well as the man to whom the management is finally given (so far at least as you have any voice in the matter), are men of the highest honor, integrity, and sincerity. Remember that mere brilliancy doesn't count in the long run, that shifty political methods are of questionable value at any time, and that the use of such methods when employed to advance interests so eminently just and reasonable as ours are is criminal folly and must react on our cause.

To those of you who do not know me, I wish to say that I will only champion a cause the justice of which I am fully convinced of, and that once enlisted in such a cause I will not act on the assumption that the end justifies the means, but will countenance only such means as are worthy of the end desired. This may render me liable to the charge that I am impracticable; very well, I accept the charge and tell you plainly that if you are looking for a practical politician to lead you, don't elect me.

Now, a word as to my attitude toward affiliating with the American Federation of Labor.

I attended the meeting addressed on February 26 by their national organizer, wherein full discussion took place, as a result of which I am convinced that affiliation offers some advantages, but that all things considered it would be a very unwise step, and I earnestly advise all clerks to put their faith in their own organization and by taking an active, earnest interest in the Railway Mail Association so build it up in devotion and enthusiasm as to render all outside aid as superfluous as it is distasteful.

While I don't care to raise the class question, and sincerely hope that progressive promotions will soon do away with all jealousy between one class and another, still I know that many of you have long felt that you should have the opportunity to vote into office as your president one who is not a "clerk in charge," and that there are some good, weighty arguments in favor of so doing. I would say to all such that here is your opportunity. Another thing, I don't want you to think that I am trying to induce you to work for me; on the contrary, it is your work that I am engaged in, your cause that I am enlisted in, and I promise you that if elected I will at all times be guided rather by that wisdom which comes from a "multitude of council" than by any idea that I know what you want better than you do yourselves.

Just a word as to this service promotion that all seem to consider such alluring bait; when you meet a candidate who has announced himself as favoring this idea, buttonhole him and find out what he means by "service promotion"; see if he has really given the subject serious thought and can advance strong arguments for its adoption from the standpoint of the "department" as well as from that of the clerks.

I understand that one prominent candidate who has in his announcement in the Post Office told us that he supported this measure for some time past and does so at present is on record as favoring "service promotion" up to the $1,200 grade. Well, this isn't my idea of an acceptable system of "service promotion" at all, and I don't think that it is yours. So find out for yourselves what the various candidates mean by this statement.

Now, to all clerks: This association has a glorious future as it has an honorable past, and you certainly owe it to yourselves to join with us if you have not already done so, and to take an active part in all its affairs.

Faithfully, yours,

C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

EXHIBIT H.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 31, 1911.*

Then personally appeared Henry H. Branchaud, of Rutland, Vt., who, being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he has known Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush for a great many years, but has been very intimately acquainted with him since the fall of 1910. That since the fall of 1910 and until Mr. Quackenbush's removal from the service in March, 1911, both men were rooming together in the same dormitory in Boston, and your deponent says that on numerous occasions he has conversed with Mr. Quackenbush and heard the latter converse with others on points concerning the Railway Mail Service and on numerous occasions he has heard Mr. Quackenbush urge strongly against the clerks' affiliation with the American Federation of Labor and had spoken very strongly against the advisability of striking or using force or violence of any kind whereby the public interests would be affected. And your deponent further says that he has heard Mr. Quackenbush denounce the methods employed by the Harpoon on numerous occasions.

And your deponent further says that from his intimate acquaintance with Mr. Quackenbush he can confidently say that Mr. Quackenbush has not been guilty of the charges as specified in the circular letter of Herbert M. Chase, dated May 25, 1911.

HENRY H. BRANCHAUD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 31st day of May, 1911.

HERBERT M. CHASE, *Notary Public.*

EXHIBIT I.

FIRST DIVISION RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 8, 1911.

C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
President First Division Railway Mail Association,
Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR QUACKENBUSH: I will state that, as far as I am personally concerned, to the best of my knowledge I never heard you mention the American Federation of Labor, and your only position in this matter that I know of personally is the one you made in your public announcement when running for the office of president of the First Division Railway Mail Association.

Yours, fraternally, H. R. STODDARD, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT J.

[Resolutions of Feb. 12, 1911.]

DETRIMENTAL TO PUBLIC.

Whereas we, the railway postal clerks of the first division, Railway Mail Service, have reason to be dissatisfied with conditions as at present existing, due to recent ideas of economy, thereby imposing unbearable hardships on the clerks of this service and impairing their efficiency, to the great detriment of the public; therefore, be it

Resolved, That an average of five hours of terminal, car, and road duty, or 100 miles, shall constitute a day's work for a railway postal clerk; that the above hours shall be computed on a year of 289 working days.

Resolved, That we being the only class of Government employees required to travel on Government business without receiving adequate traveling allowance that we feel that our travel pay should be increased to at least $2 per day.

DEMAND FREE SPEECH.

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert, as American citizens engaged in Government service, that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens. We demand the rescinding of the order.

Resolved, That all grievances arising between officials of the Post Office Department and the railway postal clerks be submitted to our superior officials, through a committee appointed by the clerks, and that in case no agreement is thereby reached, said committee shall have the privilege of direct appeal to Congress.

Resolved, That to reestablish the former efficiency of the Railway Mail Service is of the highest importance to the public, and can best be accomplished by the enforcement of these resolutions.

AGENT IN WASHINGTON.

Resolved, That we believe that our national executive committee should engage a competent person, who is not a Government employee, to represent our interests at times at Washington or elsewhere, and that the per capita tax should be increased sufficiently to cover the salary of the same.

Resolved, That this meeting appoint a committee of 10 from the floor to draft such changes in the division constitution as will materially strengthen the association, as owing to present limitations it has been ineffective; said committee to report at a special meeting not later than March 10, 1911.

EXHIBIT K.

FIRST DIVISION RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 31, 1911.

C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
President First Division Railway Mail Association,
Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR QUACKENBUSH: Following is a copy of that part of the minutes of the meeting of March 12, 1911, relative to the withdrawal of the resolution offered by you. The original minutes read as follows:

"Mr. Quackenbush withdrew his resolution in favor of the one just offered by Mr. Slocum."

The minutes as they were unanimously amended at the meeting of May 21, when the minutes of the March 12 meeting were read, read as follows:

"President asked Mr. Quackenbush if he would withdraw his resolution. He (Quackenbush) said yes, if the meeting so desired, or words to that effect."

Yours, fraternally,

H. R. STODDARD,
Secretary First Division Railway Mail Association.

EXHIBIT L.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 25, 1911.*

And now comes ——— ———, who on oath deposes and says * * * and whom I know to be in good standing in the service, that he attended the meeting of the first division, Railway Mail Service, held in Boston, February 12, 1911. That during an informal discussion after the so-called Slocum resolution had been offered by Slocum himself and had been passed Mr. Quackenbush told him that he had positively refused to offer the said Slocum resolution, although he had been urged to do so by Slocum, and that he refused to have his name connected in any way, shape, or manner with Slocum's own resolution as it was worded.

——— ———.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on the day and date above written.

HERBERT MANN CHASE,
Notary Public.

Now comes Herbert M. Chase, an attorney at law, with offices at 84 State Street, Boston, Mass., being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that the foregoing is a true copy of an affidavit signed by a railway mail clerk whom he knows to be in good standing and at the present time employed in the service, and that the foregoing affidavit was subscribed in his presence and acknowledged and sworn to before him, a notary public for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

HERBERT MANN CHASE,
Notary Public.

Subscribed and sworn to on May 31, 1911, before me.

JEROME C. SMITH,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT M.

Fellow Members of the First Division, Railway Mail Association:

After due consideration, I beg to announce that I am a candidate for the office of president of your honorable body. In connection with this announcement I wish to say that I have not asked the permission of nor consulted with any living being, and therefore am not pledged in any way to any man, nor will I be, and only to such measures as I now do or later will publicly indorse.

I accept and indorse every word of the resolutions adopted at the meeting of February 12.

I believe fully in both the justice and expediency of service promotion, and will endeavor to impress upon the clerks themselves first, and later the department and the public, the reasonableness and advisability of this great epoch-marking change.

I am in favor of the "Goulden retirement" bill.

I am not in favor of making the Harpoon our association paper, believing that our own paper, the Railway Post Office, under its present editor, Mr. Kidwell, will prove entirely satisfactory.

I believe that all our requests for better conditions are founded in reason and justice, and if granted will result in an increased efficiency fully commensurate with the cost and are therefore in line with an enlightened public policy.

As to where I stand on any other question I will answer any one at any time. In conclusion, I have no personal ambitions to be attained through this office other than to advance the interests of all the clerks of the Railway Mail Service, and only hope to benefit personally to the extent that all are benefited.

Fraternally, yours,

——— ———.

N. B.—I have been asked "Would I withdraw in favor of a stronger (?) candidate should one be forthcoming?" My answer is, Positively no. And I promise those who support my candidacy that I will stick until the last ballot is counted and make an aggressive fight all the way.

EXHIBIT N.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 21, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, clerks in the first division, Railway Mail Service, and former associates of Mr. Charles Quackenbush, understanding that it is your wish to have an expression from us as to the conduct of Mr. Quackenbush while in this service, beg to respectfully state that, to the best of our knowledge, he has always conducted himself in a gentlemanly and orderly manner and has not been a trouble maker or an originator or leader of strife and discontent among his fellow clerks.

EXHIBIT O.

POSTAL CLERKS' MUTUAL ASSOCIATION
OF THE FIRST DIVISION, RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
New Haven, Conn., May 28, 1911.

Mr. HERBERT M. CHASE,
84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

SIR: Inclosed you will find your letter of May 22, to which I have affixed the information you requested relative to the character, conduct, and expressed sentiments of Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush.

I do not hesitate to state that Mr. Quackenbush was not responsible in any degree for any discontent or insubordination which is alleged to have existed in the first division during the past six months.

I am pleased to learn that such an intelligent effort is being made to show our chiefs at Washington the true picture of our friend, and I hope and believe that you will meet with success.

You are at liberty to use this letter and my name, as I have no fear that my superior officers will resent any properly conducted movement in the interest of justice and truth.

I have met and talked with Mr. Stewart and I assure you that if you can convince him that he has done a wrong, he will hasten to right it.

Very truly, yours, JOHN E. BRENNAN.

EXHIBIT B.

BOSTON, MASS., *April 6, 1911.*

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK, *Postmaster General,*
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, railway postal clerks in the first division, respectfully urge that you reconsider the order of March 31 removing from our number Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush, a brother clerk for whom we have the highest regard and who, we feel sure, could absolve himself from any charges of conduct detrimental to the service upon a hearing on that point.

Robert S. Pratt, Colby Curtis, G. G. Campbell, M. F. Kelly, F. W. Merrill, D. P. Hurley, E. J. Thornton, F. T. Knight, J. A. Belcher, F. W. Cousins, W. R. Carpenter, C. E. Crafts, C. H. Davis, H. R. Keene, M. W. Meany, F. G. Luce, W. H. Barter, G. W. Noyes, M. M. Kimball, W. V. Ludden, M. F. Hurley, Louis F. Tapley, Henry Colman, J. W. Hastings, T. B. Hurley, F. W. Andrews, V. B. Dennison, E. P. Brown, C. B. Hayes, John H. Ellis, W. C. Edgerley, A. F. Robinson, R. M., Kennard, L. L. Brown, R. A. Sylvester, L. M. Leonard, R. N. Marsh, F. J. Murry, Wm. N. Shaw, B. A. Smith, J. C. Gibbs, C. A. Rikens, B. A. Hobson, B. G. Hadfield, W. E. Bradley, R. H. Mason, E. F. Upham, J. J. O'Donnell, T. J. Regan, J. P. Irwin, C. A. Monroe, M. C. Schilling, J. B. Keller, T. F. O'Mahony, Walter T. Larkin, T. H. Barry, G. H. Gerry, S. F. Dinand, W. A. J. Daley, E. H. Olson, D. E. Roberts, L. K. Phillips, A. V. Mosher, J. F. Foley, W. N. McNulty, A. J. Millward, W. H. Compton, C. O. Viall, A. C. Sefton, Wm. Hennessey, C. A. Adolphson, E. R. Nash, J. L. Kelsch, A. D. McLaughlin, F. J. Bertsch, J. E. Sullivan, James S. Kennedy, M. H. Fanner, J. F. Fitzgerald, J. Fleming, W. D. Shaw, J. D. Austin, R. Koysch, M. E. Riley, C. R. Roberts, C. W. Mudgett, James T. Carey, Chas. A. Wight, R. K. Allen, W. T. Aiken, Franklin Brimmer, J. A. Wetmore, R. A. Munson, M. J. Gray, H. J. Jones, F. E. Sleams, E. C. Clement, T. F. Lynch, J. M. Doyle, Lawrence Matthews, J. E. Duffy, R. H. Stratton, D. J. Curry, H. C. Wright, W. G. O'Donnell, R. G. Warner, M. F. Garvey, M. H. Feeley, F. H. Wimpley, M. D. Ferguson, J. F. McNamara, S. E. Brown, C. W. Phelps, J. M. Hart, A. J. Young, C. D. Crosby, J. E. Thompson, J. McGuinness, Jas. F. Donovan, H. M. Ryan.

A. D. Edgerton, J. M. Ashley, G. W. Scott, C. F. Cleveland, J. R. Roberts, W. A. Goddard, W. O. Lacomet, W. A. Raymond, R. J. Houghton, C. L. Malaney, T. W. Kennedy, J. E. Ricker, G. Gnaim, Ray P. Tuttle, H. F. Madepian, F. W. Maxiam, B. E. Goodnough, F. P. Davis, C. B. Metcalf, W. S. Lyon, I. W. Weetestee, I. H. Estey, Thos. G. Cashman, G. E. Fletcher, J. H. Sooley, H. H. Branchand.

J. Morrison, John E. Brennan, W. F. Towne, R. L. Good, L. C. Boss, J. J. Sullivan, John Webster, Jas. J. Flynn, G. B. Meechan, Edgar C. Oldham, W. J. Maudsley, J. C. O'Brien, F. X. O'Began, Henry Hicks, jr., Chas. J. Lihme, Chas. H. S. LeRay, W. B. Collis, W. T. Leitch.

William T. McKay, Chas. A. Flagg, Geo. J. Moulton, Fremont C. Dolber, W. S. Morrill, F. A. H. Millivard, George M. Wragg, A. W. Buswell, L. J. Mongeon, G. E. Tyler, Carl Dent, S. A. Simmons, G. D. Millington, T. J. Powers, Thos. A. Drum, W. J. Willard, J. A. Frye, J. P. Fonda, W. J. O. Crorin, S. C. Barnes, E. I. Whitney, P. T. McCarty, T. McKean.

Herbert F. French, W. U. Davis, J. T. Barker, F. D. Somers, George A. Nettleton, O. A. Pechtold, P. F. Connor, J. D. Conrad, F. Mulkern, R. E. Bridgett, H. W. Gilbert, E. E. Thompson, J. W. Collins.

John Dunclar, clerk in charge, Boston, Springfield, and New YorkRailway Post Office; E. O. Hea, Boston and Poughkeepsie; E. R. Sherman, Boston and Poughkeepsie; E. D. Eighmie, Boston and Poughkeepsie; J. P. McMahon, Stamford and New York; E. R. Gilman, Hartford and Saybrook; A. M. Hurlbut, clerk in charge, Boston and

Poughkeepsie; C. B. Squires, Boston and Poughkeepsie; J. F. Blake, clerk in charge, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; H. Whalen, Hartford State Line; J. Hogan, Boston and Poughkeepsie; H. W. Wyman, Hartford and State Line; A. H. Beckley, Boston and Poughkeepsie.

Charles Wieser, Alva N. Simmons, M. D. O'Brien, H. W. Wheeler, M. L. Wheeler, H. L. Lorion, D. E. Quinliran, E. E. Goulding, F. C. Carr, J. A. Prucker, F. W. Cady, J. S. O'Brien, A. A. Hadley, C. L. Shear, Norman Hallock, H. N. Schwartz, F. W. Merten, H. A. Price, Edw. J. Bridgett, W. W. Stone.

W. S. Fitz Gibbon, Springfield Terminal Railway Post Office; William B. Quilty, Boston and Springfield Railway Post Office; Norman S. Chapman, Springfield and Hartford Railway Post Office; C. A. Lemille, Springfield Terminal Railway Post Office; J. E. Bolger, Springfield Terminal Railway Post Office; W. C. Looney, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; W. H. Hibbard, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; J. M. King, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; J. J. Byrne, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; P. Raffert, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; G. W. Taylor, Boston & Albany Railway Post Office; Frank Clarkson, Boston and Albany Railway Post Office; J. J. Lundy; C. J. Caffrey, Boston, Springfield, and New York Railway Post Office; Geo. Smith, Boston; A. T. Stoddard, Newport and Springfield; H. L. Brown, Boston Springfield, and New York; E. R. Houghton, New York and Springfield; E. J. Howard, New York and Springfield; W. M. Stoddard, New York and Springfield; J. H. Hayes, Boston and Albany.

L. R. Bailey, C. H. Graham, J. J. Cannon, E. C. Lynch, E. L. Knowles, F. E. Brown, F. J. Sailer, John F. Landiegan, H. W. Sturtevant, I. S. Brooks, C. J. Caffrey, F. A. Bailey; J. F. Horacek, Boston and Albany Railway post office; F. E. Newton, D. L. Foley; Andrew E. Doyle, Springfield, Mass., terminal railway post office; H. H. Brown; C. Morton, Boston and Albany; J. H. Shaw, Boston and Albany; M. F. Hickey, Boston and Albany; John T. Harrington; O. E. Howe; P. J. Bolger, Springfield terminal; C. A. Wheaton.

EXHIBIT C.

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, being supervisory officials of the first division, Railway Mail Service, and former associates of Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush in this service, understanding that it is your wish to have an expression from us as to the conduct of Mr. Quackenbush while in this service, beg to respectfully state that, to the best of our knowledge, he has always conducted himself in a gentlemanly and orderly manner and has not been a trouble maker or an originator of strife and discontent among his fellow clerks.

Edw. J. Ryan, superintendent, Railway Mail Service; T. H. Collins, chief clerk, Boston, Springfield and New York railway post office; E. P. Jewett, late chief clerk, Boston, Springfield and New York; Edward F. Goggin, chief in charge, Boston, Springfield and New York railway post office; R. J. Gorman, chief in charge, Boston, Springfield and New York railway post office; F. W. Merten, chief in charge, Boston, Springfield and New York railway post office.

EXHIBIT D.

RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Portsmouth, N. H., April 8, 1911.

Mr. C. H. QUACKENBUSH, *Railway Postal Clerk,*
Springdale, Conn.

MY DEAR SIR: Under instructions from the executive committee of the Railway Mail Association, I am directed to advise you that your membership in the said association has been canceled this day.

I beg to offer to return to you upon demand any advance assessments which you may have paid that have not been levied at this time.

Kindly return your certificates in the inclosed envelope.

Respectfully, yours,

GEO. A. WOOD, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT E.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
County of Rockingham, ss:

I, George A. Wood, of Portsmouth, State and county aforesaid, being duly sworn, depose and say that I am clerk of the Railway Mail Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Hampshire, and that there is on file in the office of the clerk a certain letter, dated April 7, 1911, addressed to me as secretary of the Railway Mail Association, of which the following is a true copy:

"[First division, Railway Mail Association, comprising the New England States. A. C. Walton, president, 39 Hampstead Road, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; H. R. Stoddard, secretary, room 83, post office building, Boston, Mass.]

"APRIL 7, 1911.

"Mr. GEO. A. WOOD, *Secretary,*
"*Portsmouth, N. H.*

"SIR: After consulting and talking freely with many members and a committee of members to advise with me, I am firmly of the opinion it is my duty to recommend the removal of Charles H. Quackenbush from the Railway Mail Association, and I do so recommend.

"A. C. WALTON,
"*President of First Division, Railway Mail Association.*"

GEORGE A. WOOD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of May, 1911.

[SEAL.] WALTER E. LOONEY,
Notary Public.

[EXHIBIT F.]

[The Boston Post, Wednesday, April 12, 1911.]

OUSTED MAN ELECTED BY MAIL CLERKS—QUACKENBUSH MADE PRESIDENT AFTER BITTER FIGHT.

In the most spirited convention in the history of division 1, Railway Mail Clerks' Association of New England, held at the South End last night, C. H. Quackenbush, who was recently dismissed from the Government service, was elected president overwhelmingly.

A. C. Walton, of Jamaica Plains, Quackenbush's opponent, refused to recognize an order of the court restraining him from interfering with the election and remained in the chair until he was threatened with arrest for contempt of court.

Quackenbush received 563 votes and his opponent 328 votes.

WILL CONTEST ELECTION.

Walton, as he left the hall, stated that his opponent's election would be contested by the executive committee of the National Railway Mail Clerks' Association later, and all members who had helped elect him brought to account for their actions.

It was openly asserted at the meeting that Walton is a special agent for the Government and that he has brought about the dismissal of both C. H. Quackenbush and H. C. Slocum from Federal service on account of their activity in working for a repeal of the gag law and being candidates for office against him in the Railway Mail Clerks' Association.

Slocum, who for eight years ran between Boston and New York, was dismissed from Government service last March. He was also dropped from the association.

On April 8 last, Quackenbush, then president of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association of New England, was dismissed from Government service. Then, like Slocum, he was dropped from the membership of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association.

Other officers elected were F. W. Winkley, vice-president; H. R. Stoddard, secretary; Messrs. French, McFarland, Murphy, and Streck were appointed members of the executive committee.

Harry E. Slocum, Ed. J. Ryan, E. J. Nettleton, and S. Lyman Hayes were elected delegates to the National Railway Mail Clerks' convention in June, at Syracuse, with these alternates: E. A. Wilkie, J. Killcup, and Messrs. Shaw, Bailey, Nason, and Murphy.

Although Candidate Walton told the Post man that the election of Quackenbush is illegal, as both he and Slocum were dropped from the association, his claim is denied by the members, who say that the election will stand.

CLAIM INFLUENCE.

Officers of the association claim that spite and political influence brought about the dismissal of both men from the Federal service, but that they will be reinstated.

"I do not know why the men were dismissed from the Government service," said Walton yesterday. "I do know, however, that they were expelled from the Railway Mail Clerks' Association for conduct detrimental to the interests of the organization."

President Quackenbush said: "I am glad to see that not only was my association with the organization made apparent by the United States Court, in its order restraining Mr. Walton from interfering with my election, but on account of the handsome vote I received in being elected as president of division 1.

"Regarding my dismissal from the Government service, well, it was because I was misrepresented. As to my being dropped from the association, that was solely done by the national executive committee in New York on account of my recent visit to Washington, and my candidacy against A. C. Walton, a member of the national executive board.

"My vindication has been complete, and I will henceforth give my best interests to the association."

A communication was read from the city council of Stamford, Conn., testifying to the excellent character of Quackenbush, and the faithful, honest, and efficient service he had rendered the Government in his 14 years' service as mail clerk.

The communication also stated that an appeal had been sent to the congressional and senatorial representatives of Connecticut to bring about a hearing of the charges against Quackenbush so that he can defend himself.

It is understood that Slocum's case will be considered at the same time.

The meeting adjourned with the executive committee of the Railway Mail Clerks' Association being censured for trying to drop both men from the association and apparent interest in the dismissal of both from Federal service.

A publicity bureau at Washington, to look out for the interests of the railway mail clerks, was established.

EXHIBIT G.

STAMFORD, CONN., *March 16, 1911.*

Fellow members of the Railway Mail Association—Attention:

I offer for your careful consideration the following observations, these to be considered as supplementary to my former announcement by circular and by publication in the Railway Post Office:

As many of you have probably surmised, the most important issues of this campaign are not on the surface; acquaint yourselves with the underlying motives and vote and act accordingly.

That I am in this fight at all is proof that I deem the issue of supreme importance, for in all the years that I have been one of your number I have shown no desire for office of any kind in either of our associations.

Your national association is about to embark on a most important venture, one that I earnestly recommend and expect to work for with all the intelligence and energy I can command. I refer to the proposed establishing of a publicity bureau at Washington, D. C. See to it that the men intrusted with the shaping and guiding of this movement, as well as the man to whom the management is finally given (so far at least as you have any voice in the matter), are men of the highest honor, integrity, and sincerity. Remember that mere brilliancy doesn't count in the long run, that shifty political methods are of questionable value at any time, and that the use of such

methods when employed to advance interests so eminently just and reasonable as ours are is criminal folly and must react on our cause.

To those of you who do not know me, I wish to say that I will only champion a cause the justice of which I am fully convinced of, and that once enlisted in such a cause I will not act on the assumption that the end justifies the means, but will countenance only such means as are worthy of the end desired. This may render me liable to the charge that I am impracticable. Very well, I accept the charge and tell you plainly that if you are looking for a practical politician to lead you, don't elect me.

Now a word as to my attitude toward affiliating with the American Federation of Labor.

I attended the meeting addressed on February 26 by their national organizer, wherein full discussion took place, as a result of which I am convinced that affiliation offers some advantages, but that all things considered, it would be a very unwise step, and I earnestly advise all clerks to put their faith in their own organization, and by taking an active, earnest interest in the Railway Mail Association, so build it up in devotion and enthusiasm as to render all outside aid as superfluous as it is distasteful.

While I don't care to raise the "class" question, and sincerely hope that progressive promotions will soon do away with all jealousy between one class and another, still I know that many of you have long felt that you should have the opportunity to vote into office as your president one who is not a "clerk in charge," and that there are some good weighty arguments in favor of so doing. I would say to all such that here is your opportunity. Another thing: I don't want you to think that I am trying to induce you to work for me; on the contrary, it is your work that I am engaged in, your cause that I am enlisted in, and I promise you that if elected I will at all times be guided rather by that wisdom which comes from a "multitude of council" than by any idea that I know what you want better than you do yourselves.

Just a word as to this service promotion that all seem to consider such alluring bait: When you meet a candidate who has announced himself as favoring this idea, buttonhole him and find out what he means by "service promotion"; see if he has really given the subject serious thought and can advance strong arguments for its adoption from the standpoint of the "department" as well as from that of the clerks.

I understand that one prominent candidate who has in his announcement in the "Post Office" told us that he supported this measure for some time past and does so at present, is on record as favoring "service promotion" up to the $1,200 grade. Well, this isn't my idea of an acceptable system of "service promotion" at all, and I don't think that it is yours. So find out for yourselves what the various candidates mean by this statement.

Now, to all clerks: This association has a glorious future as it has an honorable past, and you certainly owe it to yourselves to join with us if you have not already done so, and to take an active part in all its affairs.

Faithfully yours, C. H. QUACKENBUSH.

Fellow members of the first division, railway Mail Association, after due consideration, I beg to announce that I am a candidate for the office of president of your honorable body. In connection with this announcement, I wish to say that I have not asked the permission of nor consulted with any living being, and therefore am not pledged in any way to any man, nor will I be, and only to such measures as I now do or later will publicly indorse.

I accept and indorse every word of the resolutions adopted at the meeting of February 12.

I believe fully in both the justice and expediency of service promotion, and will endeavor to impress upon the clerks themselves first, and later the department and the public, the reasonableness and advisability of this great epoch-making change.

I am in favor of the Goulden retirement bill.

I am not in favor of making the Harpoon our association paper, believing that our own paper, the Railway Post Office, under its present editor, Mr. Kidwell, will prove entirely satisfactory.

I believe that all our requests for better conditions are founded in reason and justice, and if granted will result in an increased efficiency fully commensurate with the cost, and are therefore in line with an enlightened public policy.

As to where I stand on any other question I will answer anyone at any time. In conclusion: I have no personal ambitions to be attained through this office other than to advance the interests of all the clerks of the Railway Mail Service, and only hope to benefit personally to the extent that all are benefited. Fraternally yours.

N. B.—I have been asked, "Would I withdraw in favor of a stronger (?) candidate should one be forthcoming? My answer is, positively no. And I promise those who support my candidacy that I will stick until the last ballot is counted and make an aggressive fight all the way.

EXHIBIT H.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 31, 1911.*

Then personally appeared Henry H. Branchaud, of Rutland, Vt., who, being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that he has known Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush for a great many years, but has been very intimately acquainted with him since the fall of 1910; that since the fall of 1910 and until Mr. Quackenbush's removal from the service in March, 1911, both men were rooming together in the same dormitory in Boston, and your deponent says that on numerous occasions he has conversed with Mr. Quackenbush and heard the latter converse with others on points concerning the Railway Mail Service and on numerous occasions he has heard Mr. Quackenbush urge strongly against the clerks' affiliation with the American Federation of Labor and had spoken very strongly against the advisability of striking or using force or violence of any kind whereby the public interests would be affected. And your deponent further says that he has heard Mr. Quackenbush denounce the methods employed by the Harpoon on numerous occasions.

And your deponent further says that from his intimate acquaintance with Mr. Quackenbush he can confidently say that Mr. Quackenbush has not been guilty of the charges as specified in the circular letter of Herbert M. Chase, dated May 25, 1911.

HENRY H. BRANCHAUD.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 31st day of May, 1911.

[SEAL.] HERBERT MANN CHASE,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT I.

FIRST DIVISION RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 8, 1911.

C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
President First Division Railway Mail Association, Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR QUACKENBUSH: I will state that as far as I am personally concerned, to the best of my knowledge, I never heard you mention the American Federation of Labor, and your only position in this matter that I know of personally is the one you made in your public announcement when running for the office of president of the First Division Railway Mail Association.

Yours, fraternally, H. R. STODDARD, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT K.

FIRST DIVISION, RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., May 31, 1911.

C. H. QUACKENBUSH, *President First Division, Railway Mail Association,*
Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR QUACKENBUSH: Following is a copy of that part of the minutes of the meeting of March 12, 1911, relative to the withdrawal of the resolution offered by you. The original minutes read as follows: "Mr. Quackenbush withdrew his resolution in favor of the one just offered by Mr. Slocum." The minutes as they were unanimously amended at the meeting of May 21, when the minutes of the March 12 meeting were read, read as follows: "President asked Mr. Quackenbush if he would withdraw his resolution; he (Quackenbush) said 'Yes, if the meeting so desired,' or words to that effect."

Yours fraternally,

H. R. STODDARD,
Secretary First Division, Railway Mail Association.

EXHIBIT L.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 25, 1911.*

And now comes ——— ———, who on oath deposes and says that he is a ——— ———, and whom I know to be in good standing in the service, that he attended the meeting of the first division, Railway Mail Service, held in Boston February 12, 1911. That

during an informal discussion after the so-called Slocum resolution had been offered by Slocum himself and had been passed, Mr. Quackenbush told him that he had positively refused to offer the said Slocum resolution, although he had been urged to do so by Slocum, and that he refused to have his name connected in any way, shape, or manner with Slocum's own resolution as it was worded.

———— ————.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on the day and date above written.

HERBERT MANN CHASE,
Notary Public.

Now comes Herbert M. Chase, an attorney at law with offices at 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.; being duly sworn, on oath deposes and says that the foregoing is a true copy of an affidavit signed by a railway mail clerk whom he knows to be in good standing and at the present time employed in the service, and that the foregoing affidavit was subscribed in his presence and acknowledged and sworn to before him, a notary public for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

HERBERT MANN CHASE.

Subscribed and sworn to on May 31, 1911, before me.

[SEAL.] JEROME C. SMITH,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT M.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 21, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, clerks in the first division, Railway Mail Service, and former associates of Mr. Charles Quackenbush, understanding that it is your wish to have an expressions from us as to the conduct of Mr. Quackenbush while in this service, beg to respectfully state that, to the best of our knowledge, he has always conducted himself in a gentlemanly and orderly manner and has not been a trouble maker or an originator or leader of strife and discontent among his fellow clerks:

Arthur C. Brockbrick, Joseph F. Horacek, J. C. A. Brown, E. J. Kennedy, I. Hyman, W. B. Lawson, J. J. Kennedy, Allan V. Mosher, G. E. Tyler, W. T. Davis, Alva N. Simmons, H. F. French, Jas. J. Murphy, H. R. Young, H. S. Kileup, Jas. A. Ross, A. W. Jeynes, T. F. O'Mahony, H. E. Stearns, W. S. Spalding, Walter E. Rice, C. W. Phelps, M. D. Ferguson, G. D. Mower, H. S. Joslin, J. E. Cavanagh, W. I. Cummings, E. Jas. Ryan, J. W. Meyer, Wm. C. Fry, C. H. McFarland.

EXHIBIT O.

POSTAL CLERKS' MUTUAL ASSOCIATION,
FIRST DIVISION, RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
New Haven, Conn., May 28, 1911.

Mr. HERBERT M. CHASE,
84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

SIR: Inclosed you will find your letter of May 22, to which I have affixed the information you requested relative to the character, conduct, and expressed sentiments of Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush.

I do not hesitate to state that Mr. Quackenbush was not responsible in any degree for any discontent or insubordination which is alleged to have existed in the first division during the past six months.

I am pleased to learn that such an intelligent effort is being made to show our chiefs at Washington the true picture of our friend and I hope and believe that you will meet with success.

You are at liberty to use this letter and my name as I have no fear that my superior officers will resent any properly conducted movement in the interest of justice and truth.

I have met and talked with Mr. Stewart and I assure you that if you can convince him that he has done a wrong, he will hasten to right it.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN E. BRENNAN.

MINER, READ & TULLOCK,
New Haven, Conn., May 29, 1911.

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I learned that Mr. C. H. Quackenbush of Stamford, Conn., has been dismissed from the Government service. Having known Mr. Quackenbush for more than 15 years and he having been employed as one of our staff of some 25 salesmen, I always found him a reliable worker, straight as a string, of good ability and absolutely honest. I want to add my testimony to his worth and I hope he will be accorded a hearing for his reinstatement, which I certainly believe he is entitled to.

I am, yours, very truly,

S. H. READ.

JUNE 1, 1911.

Mr. S. H. Read,
91 to 115 State Street, New Haven, Conn.

SIR: Your letter of May 29, in behalf of Mr. Quackenbush, late a clerk in the Railway Mail Service, has been received.

Very respectfully,

Second Assistant Postmastsr General.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 2, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEN. STEWART: I inclose herewith copy of letter which I sent out under date of May 22, 1911, to about 1,050 clerks of the First Division Railway Mail Association, the letter being numbered 910. When I appeared before you yesterday I made a statement which I now confirm, that up to the date of leaving my office late in the afternoon of May 31, 1911, I had received about 500 answers and that they were all signed on the perforated sheet when I received them. That every one I had received up to that time I brought to Washington and left in your office yesterday afternoon and that all those letters entirely exonerate Mr. Quackenbush from the charges set forth in the first paragraph of the same. These letters were not annonymous but were signed when received by me and the signatures were torn off by me and are now in my safe. Since reaching home I find that I have received in the mail about 75 more and have just opened same, all of which, with the exception of one only, entirely exonerate Mr. Quackenbush. Now, as regards that single exception, I will say that the party writing the letter answered "Yes" to the fourth question which reads: "Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the First Division?" Answer, "Yes." Question, "If so, in what particular?" Answer, He ran for president against A. C. Walton." I quote this answer as showing that the writer has a distinct and well-developed sense of humor. As attorney for Mr. Quackenbush I can state that out of 1,050 clerks almost 600 have written me exonerating my client from the charges set forth in the first paragraph of the circular letter of May 22, 1911.

I most sincerely hope that you will wire me Saturday what decision you and the Postmaster General have reached in Mr. Quackenbush's case. In the event your decision, in the light of the new evidence which I have offered, being still unfavorable to Mr. Quackenbush's

reinstatement in the service, I would respectfully request to be allowed to see the evidence upon which the department has acted and hope to be allowed the opportunity of knowing the witnesses against him so as to refute their testimony.

Very truly, yours,

HERBERT M. CHASE.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 22, 1911.*

To the clerks of the first division, Railway Mail Service:

GENTLEMEN: As counsel for the Railway Mail Association, on May 11, 1911, I conducted a hearing in Washington before the Hon. Joseph Stewart, Second Assistant Postmaster General, said hearing being held for the purpose of obtaining the reinstatement of Chas. H. Quackenbush in the service. It developed that the department had received certain information, and acting on that information had removed Mr Quackenbush from the service, specifically charging him with "fomenting unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks, for being a disturbing element among them and agitator against the proper administrative acts and against the policies of the department; for indorsing the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its condition, and its officers; and for inciting insubordination" among his fellow clerks. We offered evidence to show that Mr. Quackenbush had not been guilty of any of the charges above outlined. As a result Gen. Stewart reserved his decision on our petition for reinstatement until such time as we should return with further evidence to substantiate our position.

In order to furnish the evidence that Gen. Stewart desires, we are sending to the clerks of this division the list of questions below. Each letter is numbered. Will you kindly answer the questions after careful deliberation, signing your name to the perforated sheet? I will guarantee that your identity will not be disclosed. We strongly urge an answer by return mail.

Very truly, yours,

HERBERT M. CHASE,
84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

1. Are you a clerk in the first division, Railway Mail Service? Ans.
2. Are you acquainted with Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a clerk in your division? Ans.
3. State of your own knowledge and not from hearsay whether or not in your opinion Mr. Quackenbush has fomented unwarranted discontent among his fellow clerks. Ans.

If so, in what particular?

4. Has he been a disturbing element among the clerks of the said first division? Ans.

If so, in what particular.

5. Has he been an agitator against the proper administrative acts and policies of the department? Ans.

If so, in what particular?

6. Has he indorsed the efforts of those who have misrepresented the service, its conditions, and its officers? Ans.

If so, in what particular?

7. Has he at any time incited insubordination among his fellow clerks? Ans.

If so, in what particular?

8. Has he ever advocated the policy of affiliation of the clerks in this division with the American Federation of Labor? Ans.

If so, in what particular?

9. Has he ever urged you or have you ever heard him urge anyone else to join a labor organization, should one be organized in this division? Ans.

If so, when and where?

No. 910.

[Perforated.]

No. 910. Do not detach.

This sheet to be torn off by Mr. Chase and is used only to guarantee that the document is genuine.

Name ——— ———. Assignment ——— ———.

JUNE 3, 1911.

HERBERT M. CHASE,
Boston, Mass.:

Answering wire Postmaster General has not returned to department and will not be back until next week. Can not say when he will take case up.

_____ _____,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

[Telegram.]

BOSTON, MASS., *June 3, 1911.*

JOS. STEWART,
Washington, D. C.

Can we expect answer Quackenbush case to-day? Wire my expense.

HERBERT M. CHASE.

JUNE 10, 1911.

R. HERTZBERG, M. D.,
40 South Street, Stamford, Conn.

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 9th instant, in behalf of Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush for reinstatement in the Railway Mail Service.

Your letter will be considered in connection with Mr. Quackenbush's case.

Very respectfully,
_____ _____,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

STAMFORD, CONN., *June 9, 1911.*

HON. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I take the liberty to address you in regard to our fellow townsman, Mr. Charles Quackenbush, who has recently been dismissed from the postal service. As a citizen his standing is of the highest; he is a man who minds his own business and interferes with no one; his honesty is unimpeachable, his word once given is kept to the letter, and his obligations he meets like a gentleman. The charges that have been brought against him of inciting others to discontent and disobedience are not borne out by his records as a citizen and were received by all who know him in his home town with disbelief and astonishment. I desire to offer my own personal testimony in his behalf. I have known Mr. Quackenbush for the past 15 years and during that time have never known him to do a thing or be a party to any act that a gentleman need be ashamed of. He is a kindly neighbor, a good father and husband, a temperate man, not quarrelsome, and an all-around good citizen who commands the respect and friendship of all those who have the priviledge of knowing him. By our very knowledge of him we know that an injustice has

been done him and I desire to raise my voice in protest against the arbitrary manner of his dismissal. A hearing at which he can defend himself against the charges brought should in all justice be given him.

Very sincerely, yours, R. HEITZBERG, M. D.

JUNE 21, 1911.

Mr. HERBERT M. CHASE,
Attorney at Law, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your letter of the 19th instant and will give the matter careful consideration.

Very truly, yours, _____ _____,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

BOSTON, MASS., *June 19, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEWART: The clerks of this division are pressing me for a report in the Quackenbush matter. I trust that you will see your way clear to make a finding in the case at once and advise me of the result.

I am sure you will agree with me that the actions of Mr. Quackenbush since his removal have in every particular substantiated the averments made in my conversations and affidavits submitted to the department, through you, and I further believe that the best interests of the department, which demand the good will and harmonious working of the clerks, will be greatly enhanced by the reinstatement of Mr. Quackenbush.

Yours truly, HERBERT M. CHASE.

JUNE 23, 1911.

Mr. GEORGE H. FAIR,
Railway Postal Clerk, Topeka, Kans.

MY DEAR MR. FAIR: I have your letter of the 20th instant in regard to Mr. Quackenbush, and will give it my careful consideration.

Sincerely, yours,

_____ _____,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 20, 1911.*

Hon. JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I beg your pardon for writing to you upon a a matter which is, apparently, no concern of mine—the reinstatement of Mr. C. H. Quackenbush of the first division.

I do not know anything of the reasons that led up to his dismissal, but am informed that he asks to be reinstated. And my only reason for writing this is to give you a little of the inside history of the Syracuse convention and the part taken in it by the gentleman named.

The unfortunate use, by Mr. Walton, of a power placed in his hands for the protection of the Railway Mail Association enlisted the sympathy of the members everywhere in Mr. Quackenbush's favor, and the protest that went up was so strong that one of the first acts of the executive committee of the association in Syracuse was to disavow Mr. Walton's action and restore Mr. Quackenbush to membership.

He seemed to appreciate this action and instead of being a "radical" in the convention his influence was for conservative action during all of its sessions. I do not know what, if any, other reasons influenced him, but during the convention I can recall no act of his that would indicate hostile disposition toward the officials of the department.

If, under all the circumstances, such action meets the approval of the department, would it be asking too much that you give him the benefit of every doubt in his plea for reinstatement? There is no doubt but that he has a large following among the clerks in New England, and if you can find reason to grant his plea, the effect will be beneficial in allaying the discontent that exists in that section.

I trust that you will not think me presumptuous in making this request, and with best wishes for your success both personally and officially, I am,

Yours, sincerely, GEO. H. FAIR.

OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

MR. INGALLS: I have the Quackenbush papers on my desk.

STEWART.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR,
Washington, June 26, 1911.

Respectfully returned to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, in compliance with his request in communication of April 17, herewith, inviting attention to the report of Inspector C. M. Perkins, from which it appears that no additional facts have been obtained regarding the Quackenbush matter other than those which are now in the possession of the department.

Returning Railway Mail Service files No. 44679 and transmitting report of Inspector Perkins of June 22, 1911, concerning a communication addressed to the department by the newly elected executive committee of the First Division Railway Mail Association.

R. S. SHARP, *Chief Inspector.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR, BOSTON DIVISION,
Boston, Mass., June 22, 1911.

MR. LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge, Boston, Mass.

SIR: I have the honor to return herewith a letter written under date of April 12, 1911, by the newly elected executive committee of the First Division Railway Mail Association, which was forwarded to

the department through official channels and referred here for attention in connection with the recent investigation of the first division railway mail service.

The letter appears to embody three distinct features as follows:

First. An explanation of the action of the clerks in electing Mr. C. H. Quackenbush to the presidency of their association after he had been dismissed from the service.

Second. A claim that there is a feeling of unrest, uneasiness, and uncertainty among the clerks that any one of them may be summarily disciplined for some unknown offense, and that this condition has been brought about by some wrongful action of which their deposed president, Mr. A. C. Walton, is guilty.

Third. A request for an official hearing or investigation at which the committee may be heard.

In regard to the above matters I have this day had a personal interview with Mr. C. H. McFarland, one of the members of the committee, with a view to ascertaining clearly what their contention is and to determine whether any further action is required in the premises. In regard to the explanation of the action of the clerks in electing Mr. Quackenbush to head their association, Mr. McFarland stated that this action should not be construed as indicating an unfriendly attitude of the clerks toward the department, because it was not so intended, but was intended as a rebuke to Mr. Walton, who had incurred the displeasure of the clerks by his disloyalty to their interests. Mr. McFarland explained that many of the ballots were received by mail before it was known that Mr. Quackenbush had been dismissed from the service, and therefore it was then too late to unite on another candidate and secure the defeat of Mr. Walton.

In regard to the claim that there exists a feeling among the clerks that any one of them may be summarily dealt with for some offense of which they have no knowledge, Mr. McFarland acknowledged that this feeling was engendered by reason of Mr. Quackenbush having been dismissed from the service without having been afforded an opportunity to be heard in his own defense, and stated that it is the general belief of the clerks that the removal of Mr. Quackenbush was directly due to unfair representations made to the department by Mr. Walton, and that this belief was fully confirmed by the affidavits introduced in the testimony of Hon. Joseph Stewart, Second Assistant Postmaster General, during the recent hearing conducted by a committee of the House of Representatives.

In regard to the request for a hearing or investigation, Mr. McFarland stated that their purpose was to set themselves right with the department, which through unfair newspaper reports and reports from other sources had become impressed with the idea that the clerks were disloyal to the service and were advocating strikes and affiliation with labor unions. Mr. McFarland stated that an investigation would clearly show that the clerks are loyal to the department and to the service, and that there is no ground for any contrary impression which may exist by reason of misrepresentations which have been made to the department.

There appears to be no necessity for an investigation or any further action, and therefore these papers are returned for the files of the department.

Very respectfully,

C. M. PERKINS,
Inspector.

Report examined, approved, and forwarded to chief inspector June 22, 1911.

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Post-Office Inspector in Charge Division.

THE LETTER AS WRITTEN.	SUBSTANCE STATED BRIEFLY.
You have undoubtedly received unofficial accounts and have read the newspaper articles in regard to the transactions of the First Division Railway Mail Association at its annual meeting held yesterday in this city.	We presume that you have been informed as to what transpired in our association meeting yesterday.
It is the earnest desire of the undersigned—the newly elected executive committee of this association—to present for your consideration and transmission to the department the correct state of feeling of the railway mail clerks in this division. One of the leading Boston papers this morning announces that this meeting and its action was in defiance of the department. As you know, this meeting was the regular annual meeting of this association and we can, with the greatest earnestness, advise you that there was and is absolutely no such sentiment among the clerks in this division—there is simply an overwhelming and well-founded contempt for Mr. A. C. Walton, personally, and all motions and other action at said meeting which may have appeared on the outside to have been somewhat indiscreet were directed against Mr. Walton, and his standing among his fellow clerks was clearly and unequivocally announced by their ballot for presidency of this association.	We wish you would inform the department that our action in electing Mr. Quackenbush to head our association after he had been removed from the service, was not intended to be in defiance of the department, but was simply an expression of our disapproval of Mr. Walton.
This committee desired to respectfully call your attention to the fact that the unrest and uneasiness of the clerks in this division, which culminated in their somewhat strenuous expressions yesterday, is due wholly to their bitter feeling and utter disapproval of the actions of their ex-president.	Our unrest and uneasiness is due to our bitter feeling toward Mr. Walton, because of things he has done, which we disapprove.
It is not our purpose to prejudice you or the department against Mr. Walton, but we would most respectfully ask that they give this matter their careful consideration in order that the present feeling of unrest may be absolutely wiped out. It is the earnest desire of the clerks in this division to have the utmost confidence and feeling of good will between them and the department in order that they may, as in former years, perform their duties in an enthusiastic and whole-hearted manner.	There is at present a feeling of unrest which should be wiped out by the department giving this matter careful consideration. The clerks desire cordial relations to exist between the department and themselves.

As things now stand there is a feeling in the air that can not help but impair the efficiency of the division, a feeling that this man or that may be summarily disciplined for some unknown offense, and vague rumors to that effect are being daily circulated among the clerks resulting in a feeling of unrest and uncertainty. There is no doubt but what this feeling is universal among the clerks, and, in our opinion, it should be at once and for all cleared up, both for the best interests of the department and of the clerks in this division.

With the above in view, this committee respectfully requests that the Postmaster General or Second Assistant Postmaster General give them a hearing, either in Boston or Washington, or that an investigation be made by some representative of the department at which this committee may be heard.

It was the unanimous feeling at the meeting yesterday that the newly elected president, Mr. Quackenbush, should be given a hearing by the department on his removal from the service, and that he should be allowed to answer any charges which may have been preferred against him.

We think that you will agree with us that the status of this service in the first division for the past few months fully warrants this request on our part, and we desire to repeat that, with the personality of Mr. Walton eliminated from the situation, we feel positive that such a hearing or investigation will clear the atmosphere in such a manner that the services of the clerks in this division will be of immensely more credit to the department and to them.

There is a feeling that any one of us may be summarily disciplined for some unknown offense, and we would like to know at once what to expect.

In view of the foregoing we respectfully request a hearing, or an investigation at which we may be heard.

It was the unanimous feeling at the meeting yesterday that our newly elected president, Mr. Quackenbush, should be given a hearing on his removal from the service and be permitted to answer any charges which may have been preferred against him.

Our request for an investigation is warranted by the status of the service in the first division for the past few months, and we assert that with Mr. Walton eliminated an investigation will result in clerks rendering more creditable service.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
DIVISION OF RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C, April 17, 1911.

Respectfully referred to the chief inspector with request that as much information as possible be obtained in regard to the conditions set forth, and the same be submitted to this office.

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

[Memorandum.]

SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
April 15, 1911.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT,
Division of Railway Mail Service:

I am returning files 44679, under your reference of the 13th and 14th instants, with approval of your recommendation that they be referred to the chief inspector for investigation and report

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
DIVISION OF RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C, April 13, 1911.

Respectfully forwarded to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, inviting attention to the attached clipping from the Boston Advertiser of April 12, relative to railway mail conditions in the first division. I would recommend that this be referred to the chief inspector for his information and with request that he make investigation for the purpose of securing as much information as possible in regard to the conditions referred to, and to submit the same to this office.

THEO INGALLS,
General Superintendent.

[Clipping from the Boston Daily Advertiser of April 12.]

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS ELECT QUACKENBUSH—NEW ENGLAND BRANCH MAKES HIM PRESIDENT—BY AID OF UNITED STATES COURT HE FOILED ATTEMPT TO SIDETRACK HIM BECAUSE OF RECENT DISMISSAL.

Charles H. Quackenbush, of Stamford, Conn., was elected president of the New England Railway Mail Association at its annual meeting, held in Castle Square Hall, Tremont Street, yesterday.

Earlier in the day he appeared before Judge Dodge in the United States district court and was granted a temporary restraining order against Alvah C. Walton, president of the organization, and others, who sought to keep him from participating in the meeting.

He was escorted to the chair only after President Walton had refused for some time to surrender it.

Quackenbush was discharged from the Railway Mail Service a week ago by the Postmaster General for reaosns never made known. Monday he received notice from George A. Woods, national secretary of the Railway Mail Association, that he had been dropped from the membership of that organization.

Being dismissed from membership in the parent organization Quackenbush was then looked upon as not being eligible to membership in the New England branch, and therefore could not participate in the meeting to-day.

Attorney G. K. Bartlett appeared for President Walton et al. and Henry M. Chase for Quackenbush.

Counsel for the petitioner held that the national association had no right to drop a member in good standing. On the other hand, Attorney Bartlett contended that the parent organization had the right to drop a member since he no longer was employed in the service of the Post Office Department.

Judge Dodge, after hearing arguments of counsel, granted the temporary restraining order so that Quackenbush could take part in the meeting yesterday. The respondents were given additional time to produce more definite authority for dropping Quackenbush from membership. The court will then take final action.

Friends and supporters of Quackenbush place the blame for all the trouble upon the shoulders of President Walton.

Quackenbush has said that he had insurance and sick benefit rights in the division, acquired by payment of assessments, and that he can not be legally deprived of them without formal trial on charges.

A heated discussion followed, after which the resolutions were temporarily withdrawn from discussion as another motion was pending, but were unanimously passed later in the session.

Cheers greeted the reading of a telegram announcing that the city council of Stamford, Conn., adopted resolutions calling on the Connecticut Senators and Congressman Hill to have the Railway Mail Service investigated.

President Walton, who is a member of the executive committee of the national association, was asked how many of that committee had voted to drop Quackenbush and Slocum.

"Well," said Walton, "I voted to expel them for the good of the order." This was greeted with hoots, which ended when a recess was taken to count the ballots for division officers.

At yesterday's meeting a resolution extending to Quackenbush the division's sympathy, respect, and promise of aid in his effort to secure a hearing on the causes of his removal was introduced by H. E. Slocum of Springfield, who was summarily dismissed from the service a month ago. The resolution also expressed abhorrence at the act of the national executive committee in supporting the attempt to make it appear that the association does not support Quackenbush. It declares it the more despicable because he is now trying to overcome misrepresentation at Washington.

After the ballots had been counted President Walton called the meeting to order and appointed M. D. O'Brien acting secretary, as the secretary had been called home on account of his wife's illness.

Carl Dent, chairman of the ballot committee, read the report of the vote for president, which was: Charles H. Quackenbush, 563 votes; President Walton, 328 votes.

Although President Walton at first ruled it out of order as unnecessary, he finally put a motion accepting the committee's report.

Then it was suggested by several members that President Walton relinquish the chair to the newly elected president. This he refused to do on the ground that it was his duty to take the action because the newly elected president was ineligible to hold the office, as he was no longer a member of the organization.

Various motions were then made with a view to inducing President Walton to vacate the chair, but he refused to entertain any of them. Finally the court's order restraining him from interfering with Charles H. Quackembush's enjoyment of full privileges of membership in the organization was read, and it was plainly stated as the belief of several that in refusing to relinquish the chair he was making himself liable for contempt of court. After many protests, he finally put a motion, which was carried unanimously, to the effect that he vacate the chair and the newly elected president be inducted into office.

President Walton then withdrew, declaring he did so under protest.

President Quackenbush then took the chair. He thanked the members for the honor conferred upon him, especially at this time when he had been removed from the Railway Mail Service and had such a fight on his hands.

A collection was taken up which amounted to $68 and it was voted to appoint a man on every trunk line to collect funds to defray the expenses of President Quackenbush and H. E. Slocum of Springfield in making their fights for reinstatment in the service. It was also voted to assess every member $1 a month to pay President Quackenbush, Mr. Slocum, and any others that might be removed from the service under similar conditions, salaries equivalent to the salaries they received in the service.

The other officers were reelected and delegates and alternates were elected to the national convention and amendments to the constitution were adopted.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
DIVISION OF RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1911.

Respectfully forwarded to the Second Assistant Postmaster General with recommendation that this communication from the newly elected executive committee of the First Division Railway Mail Asso-

ciation be referred to the chief inspector for an investigation as to the general conditions to which reference is made.

THEO. INGALLS,
General Superintendent.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
DIVISION OF RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT FIRST DIVISION,
Boston, Mass., April 12, 1911.

GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT R. M. S.,
Washington, D. C.

Forwarded as requested, for the information of the honorable Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General, and yourself.

EDW. J. RYAN,
Superintendent.

FIRST DIVISION, RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., April 12, 1911.

Mr. EDWARD J. RYAN,
Superintendent Railway Mail Service,
Boston, Mass.

SIR: You have, undoubtedly, received unofficial accounts, and have read the newspaper articles, in regard to the transactions of the First Division Railway Mail Association at its annual meeting held yesterday in this city.

It is the earnest desire of the undersigned—the newly elected executive committee of this association—to present for your consideration and transmission to the department the correct state of feeling of the railway mail clerks in this division. One of the leading Boston papers this morning announces that this meeting and its action was in defiance of the department. As you know, this meeting was the regular annual meeting of this association and we can, with the greatest earnestness, advise you that there was and is absolutely no such sentiment among the clerks in this division—there is simply an overwhelming and well-founded contempt for Mr. A. C. Walton, personally, and all motions and other action at said meeting which may have appeared on the outside to have been somewhat indiscreet were directed against Mr. Walton, and his standing among his fellow clerks was clearly and unequivocally announced by their ballot for presidency of this association.

This committee desires to respectfully call to your attention the fact that the unrest and uneasiness of the clerks in this division, which culminated in their somewhat strenuous expressions yesterday, is due wholly to their bitter feeling and utter disapproval of the actions of their ex-president.

It is not our purpose to prejudice you or the department against Mr. Walton, but we would most respectfully ask that they give this matter their careful consideration in order that the present feeling of unrest may be absolutely wiped out. It is the earnest desire of the clerks in this division to have the utmost confidence and feeling of good will between them and the department in order that they may, as in former years, perform their duties in an enthusiastic and wholehearted manner.

As things now stand there is a feeling in the air that can not help but impair the efficiency of the division—a feeling that this man or that may be summarily disciplined for some unknown offense; and vague rumors to that effect are being daily circulated among the clerks, resulting in a feeling of unrest and uncertainty. There is no doubt but what this feeling is universal among the clerks, and, in our opinion, it should be once and for all cleared up, both for the best interests of the department and of the clerks in this division.

With the above in view, this committee respectfully requests that the Postmaster General or Second Assistant Postmaster General give them a hearing, either in Boston or Washington, or that an investigation be made by some representative of the department at which this committee may be heard.

It was the unanimous feeling at the meeting yesterday that the newly elected president, Mr. Quackenbush, should be given a hearing by the department on his removal from the service, and that he be allowed to answer any charges which may have been preferred against him.

We think that you will agree with us that the status of this service in the first division for the last few months fully warrants this request on our part; and we desire to repeat that, with the personality of Mr. Walton eliminated from the situation, we feel positive that such a hearing or investigation will clear the atmosphere in such a manner that the services of the clerks in this division will be of immensely more credit to the department and to them.

Respectfully submitted.

F. H. Winkley,
Fred. C. Streck,
Herbert F. French,
C. H. McFarland,
Executive Committee of the First Division Railway Mail Association.

June 28, 1911.

Mr. Herbert M. Chase,
Attorney at Law, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

Sir: I have your letter of the 26th instant, and in reply beg to refer you to my letter of the 21st instant.

Very respectfully, ——— ———,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Boston, Mass., *June 26, 1911.*

Hon. Joseph Stewart,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I have your note of the 21st instant acknowledging receipt of mine of the 19th.

As you will recall, Mr. Quackenbush was removed from the service three months ago, and since that time his case has been under active consideration. You will agree with me that the matter has been sufficiently discussed pro and con during that time in order to reach a final decision. I most respectfully submit that the department officer responsible for the removal of Mr. Quackenbush should imme-

diately decide whether sufficient evidence has been presented to him to justify a reversal of the removal order.

I advised the clerks in this division about a month ago that I would submit to them my written report in this case. I have delayed doing so pending definite action by your department. I can not understand what the occasion is for further delay. Either Mr. Quackenbush must consider that his connection with the Post Office Department is permanently at an end or he should be reinstated, and my findings as to the facts in the case reported to the First Division Railway Mail Association.

May I expect a decision from the department shortly?

Yours, very truly,

HERBERT M. CHASE.

AUGUST 1, 1911.

Mr. HERBERT M. CHASE,
84 State Street, Boston, Mass.

MY DEAR SIR: In the absence of Postmaster General Hitchcock, who is in New York attending the hearings of the Commission on Second Class Mail Matter, I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 31st ultimo, relative to the case of former Railway Mail Clerk Charles H. Quackenbush, and to say that it will be brought to his attention immediately on his return.

Yours, very truly,

_____ _____,
Acting Private Secretary.

BOSTON, MASS., *July 31, 1911.*

Hon. FRANK H. HITCHCOCK,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: You may recollect that on or about May 7th last, I called upon you bearing a letter of introduction from the Hon. Curtis Guild, the object of my trip to Washington being to confer with you as counsel for the first division, Railway Mail Service in regard to the removal of their present president, Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush, and was referred by you to Mr. Sharp.

Four months have elapsed since Mr. Quackenbush was removed by the department, during which time Mr. Quackenbush and I have respectfully endeavored to present his case to your subordinates in a method sanctioned by the department. We have not been successful in receiving a decision either favorable or unfavorable. As I promised some months ago to make my written report to the association and have awaited making the same in deference to your subordinates, who have advised me that the case is still under consideration, in justice to my clients, I must now make this report without further delay. Before doing so I feel that perhaps extreme courtesy on my part requires me to once more bring the matter to your attention.

I sincerely feel that this matter is of sufficient moment to receive your personal consideration at this time, inasmuch as your statements to the public through the press are to the effect that it is your desire to do justice in every particular to the railway mail clerks. A brief consideration on your part will clearly show that a great injustice has been done in the Quackenbush case and I respectfully submit

to you briefly the following statement of facts which are entirely uncontroverted and can be substantiated by unquestionable proof, much of which is now in the hands of General Stewart.

First. That Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush was removed from the service by department order of March 29, 1911, without a previous hearing or without any charges whatever having been filed against him and without his having been called upon to explain any alleged misconduct.

Second. Mr. Quackenbush has been a clerk in the service for the past 12 years with an absolutely clean record, as evidenced by the statement of his superintendent and other officials of the first division, Railway Mail Service in their statement to Gen. Stewart submitted with affidavit of Mr. Quackenbush.

Third. That no reports, either from the division superintendent of the Railway Mail Service or from the post-office inspector in charge in Boston, had been made prior to March 29, calling for disciplinary action against Mr. Quackenbush. These two sources of information being the regular and official channels of the department, I respectfully submit that you should carefully and considerately weigh any evidence which your subordinates may have received from any other source with the greatest care, in justice to Mr. Quackenbush and the other clerks in this division. Certainly you will agree with me that action on ex parte evidence of this nature without an opportunity on the part of the accused to answer the same is not a proper or dignified course for the United States Government, which is supposed to set the standard of fairness and equity to pursue.

Fourth. That the removal of any department clerk upon any such evidence and by any such method must, as it has done in this case, react seriously to the welfare of the service and cause a great feeling of distrust and fear amongst the other clerks. While the department undoubtedly has some reluctance in rescinding an order of this kind even after conclusive proof that they were in error in issuing the order originally, it undoubtedly will tend to greatly support the department contention that clerks can work out their grievances directly through them.

Fifth. Mr. Quackenbush's actions since his removal from the service have shown conclusively that he is not a fomenter of discord or dissatisfaction amongst his fellow clerks. If he were, in his position as president of the First Division Railway Mail Association and under the circumstances under which he was removed, he certainly would have made the fact well known ere this, as he certainly has strong grounds for feeling grieved.

Sixth. The railway mail clerks in this division, almost to a man, feel that a grievous injustice has been done Mr. Quackenbush, and no facts or proof whatever have been brought to their attention, either officially or unofficially, to justify his removal. The belief is unanimous that it was solely a political move by some department officer to retain Mr. Walton as president of the association and to divert the purpose of the association from a body representative of them to a source of secret information to that department officer.

I respectfully submit that as the head of the greatest department of the United States Government, and as the final arbiter in matters of vital moment to a body of thousands of hard-working and self-respecting clerks, it is incumbent upon you to look at this case from

a judicial and unbiased viewpoint, to weigh carefully the issues and contentions of the clerks who are vitally interested, and to frankly direct that Mr. Quackenbush be reinstated forthwith if it shall appear that the facts presented are true by a fair preponderance of the evidence.

Respectfully submitted.

HERBERT M. CHASE.

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, August 29, 1911.

On March 31, 1911, Mr. C. H. Quackenbush, railway postal clerk running in the Boston, Springfield, and New York railway post office, was removed from the service in accordance with your direction upon reports submitted, showing that such action would be in the best interests of the service. The papers before you indicated that there was a tendency among the clerks to organize a secret association in the service or to consider the advisability of encouraging an organization affiliated with an organization outside the service; that a feeling of unwarranted discontent and criticism was rife among the clerks, and that Mr. Quackenbush, who, incidentally, was a candidate for president of the local branch of the Railway Mail Association, was a leading spirit in creating disturbance.

The main specific facts in the evidence regarding Mr. Quackenbush's conduct were:

First. His reported connection with the calling of a meeting of clerks at which the local representative of the American Federation of Labor presented his plan.

Second. His action at a meeting of the branch railway mail association, at which time he consented to the withdrawal of his resolution in the Slocum case and to the substitution of Mr. Slocum's resolution, which was couched in obnoxious and disrespectful language; and

Third. His subsequent indorsement of the resolution adopted at the meeting of the Railway Mail Association, which was objectionable as above stated.

Mr. Quackenbush appealed to you and to me for a hearing, which was accorded him, and at which time he presented to me personally and through his attorney considerable oral and documentary evidence touching upon the points above mentioned, upon his general conduct in the service, and particularly upon his intentions in the premises. I submit herewith all the papers in the case. From all the evidence, I am in doubt as to whether he had anything to do with calling the meeting which was intended to encourage the federation idea. As to the other points regarding the Slocum resolution, while he insists that his purpose was only to secure from the department a definite statement regarding causes for removal, nevertheless his action gave support to the impropriety of the Slocum resolution. Upon the question as to whether or not he has been a disturbing and disorganizing element in the Railway Mail Service among the men with whom he has been associated, the written statement of his superin-

tendent and chief clerks, as well as the opinions of many other postal clerks are worthy of serious consideration. They are included in the papers.

After a careful examination and consideration of all the facts, I believe that while Mr. Quackenbush was not without fault in the premises, the best interests of the service would be conserved by a further consideration of his case and by his restoration to the service.

About the time Mr. Quackenbush was removed he was a candidate for the presidency of the local branch of the Railway Mail Association, to which office he was elected by the clerks who were members. He attended the convention at Syracuse, and I had an opportunity to observe his conduct and to be informed as to his attitude toward the department and its officers. I found that he acted with the conservative element and thoroughly in accord with the best interests of the department. Your attention is called to the letter addressed me by Mr. George H. Fair, president of the Seventh Division Railway Mail Association, under date of June 20, 1911, giving his judgment of Mr. Quackenbush's conduct at the convention. This letter was unsolicited.

I talked fully with other conservative officers of the association at the convention and they all expressed to me the same judgment of Mr. Quackenbush.

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Approved. ——— ———
Postmaster General.

[Memorandum for the Second Assistant Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
DIVISION OF RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE,
Washington, November 6, 1911.

Submitted herewith is a communication from Mr. P. J. Schardt, president of the Railway Mail Association, addressed to the Chief Post Office Inspector, in which he recommends, on behalf of the association, the reinstatement of Mr. Quackenbush. Attention is also called in this communication to the case of Mr. Erwin, and Mr. Schardt requests the same action in his case.

The chief inspector has forwarded this letter to you with the statement that he does not feel called upon to alter or modify the original recommendation for the removal of Mr. Quackenbush. I am also of the opinion that Mr. Quackenbush's conduct was prejudicial to the service and his influence was extremely detrimental, and I recommend that neither he nor Mr. Erwin be reinstated.

THEO INGALLS,
General Superintendent.

I have made a recommendation to the Postmaster General in each case.

STEWART.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR,
Washington, October 31, 1911.

SIR: I transmit herewith a communication, of October 28th, from P. J. Schardt, who signs himself as president, Railway Mail Association. The letter is addressed to me officially and I have informed Mr. Schardt that this is a matter that does not come under the jurisdiction of this office. A copy of my reply to Mr. Schardt is inclosed.

This office made a recommendation in the case covering the conduct of Mr. Quackenbush at the time certain railway postal clerks were exhibiting disloyalty to the service, which recommendation I do not deem it advisable to alter or modify at this time. I believed then, and am of the opinion now, that the conduct of this railway postal clerk was uncalled for and had a bad effect upon the service.

Respectfully,

R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector.

The SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Division of Railway Mail Service.

October 31, 1911.

SIR: I am in receipt of your good letter of the 28th instant suggesting the reinstatement of Quackenbush in the Railway Mail Service, and have to-day referred your letter to the honorable Second Assistant Postmaster General who has charge of matters of this character. The office of the chief inspector is not an administrative bureau.

Very respectfully,

———— ————,
Chief Inspector.

Mr. P. J. SCHARDT,
President, Railway Mail Association,
Milwaukee, Wis.

RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Milwaukee, Wis , October 28, 1911.

Hon. ROBERT S. SHARP,
Chief Post-Office Inspector, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHARP: The very cordial manner in which you received my associates and myself while we were in Washington and the frank and open way in which you discussed with us various questions affecting the postal service, have encouraged me to believe that I might, without fear of being misunderstood, write you a personal letter.

As Government employees we have a common interest in the postal service and are imbued with a common desire that the present reorganization of this service, when consummated, shall deserve and receive the approbation of the American public, shall leave no reasonable ground for dissatisfaction among the employees of the service, and shall reflect credit and honor upon the present administration.

It could hardly be expected that an institution of the magnitude of the Post Office Department could be overhauled and reorganized without inviting some opposition from without and creating some dissatisfaction within.

It appears that the department is facing an obstructive opposition from without that is extremely resolute and bitter. To what extent the attacks from without upon the department and its policies have been made more patent and more effective through the dissatisfaction within the service we are not prepared to say, but it is a matter with which we are seriously concerned and which imposes an obligation that we are not seeking to shirk

As an organization we have adhered to the policy of seeking to promote mutual confidence and respect and a spirit of cooperation through a better mutual understanding. We have maintained that there is no elemental antagonism of interests, but that the interests of the department and the rank and file of the service are reciprocal. In that connection permit me to quote from my copy of a letter which I addressed to the Hon. Second Assistant Postmaster General under date of June 16:

> In accepting the office of president of the Railway Mail Association at this time I recognize a higher duty than merely to present to the Post Office Department the desires of the clerks as expressed through the action of their convention. If I may have the confidence of the Post Office Department and of the rank and file of our service, I shall consider it my overshadowing duty to do all within my power to help allay the suspicion, ill-will, and discontent that has crept into our service and has kept it in a state of turmoil during the recent past. Unless I shall be able at the end of a year to look back and see that I have been of some real service in helping to weave a closer bond of mutual confidence, respect, and good will between the Port Office Department and the men in the ranks than exists to-day, I shall fall way short of my fondest aim. To accomplish this I shall strive in every reasonable way to work with you and not against you. I desire to be able to convince the men that the Post Office Department deserves their confidence and loyalty. I shall try to keep before me the general good of the service, and any suggestions or recommendations that I may make will only be made with that end in view and to that extent at least I hope that I may deserve to enjoy the confidence of the Post Office Department.
>
> I realize that my path is not to be a rosy one, for certain outside influences whose interests will be best served by a continuation of trouble and discontent in our service will not hesitate to represent us in a false light, to impugn our motives and our aims, to inflame, prejudice, and to embarrass us in every way.
>
> We should be careful not to furnish the ammunition they desire to strengthen their position.

The antagonism and attacks from without have not abated very noticeably since that letter was written, but we have not deviated from the policies and aims of our organization as set forth in that letter, and any recommendations that we have made to the department have been based upon broader considerations than mere self-interest

The department can afford to place some confidence and dependence in the judgment and recommendations of men whose interest in the service, whose loyalty to the public, and whose fealty to the department have been positively and effectively demonstrated, and we have faith that the department recognizes that fact and that the recommendations made during our recent conference with the Hon. Second Assistant Postmaster General and the Hon. General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service will be viewed in that light, that all reasonable grounds for complaint, especially as regards the hours of duty, will be removed, and that the result will be a better spirit and a better service.

A matter that we hoped would be settled by this time and which we would be pleased to have your department give favorable consideration to is our recommendation for the reinstatement of Mr. Erwin and Mr. Quackenbush. When we pleaded for the reinstatement of these gentlemen we had in mind more than these two individuals and their families. We had in mind the effect of their reinstatement upon the feeling of our men toward the department and their attitude toward that policy of cooperation that we have advised as the only means through which we can hope to arrive at an equitable adjustment of differences. We had in mind the object lesson that it was the militant movement that steered these men into trouble and that it was only through the regular channels and the intercession of the loyal and conservative men in the service that they could hope to be taken back into the fold. We had in mind the service.

I shall not elaborate upon our previous arguments that these men and their families have been duly punished; that they are humbled and anxious to make amends; that the stain of removal and the mental anguish suffered by them precludes the thought that they would ever again be guilty of a similar mistake; that the distressing experience through which they have passed will make of them a living warning against similar missteps by the younger element in the service; that they have appealed through the regular channels for reinstatement; that they are acknowledged to be first-class clerks; that their applications for reinstatement have the indorsement of the officials under whom they served; that they have renounced radical advisers and have appealed to the loyal men of the service; that they rendered needed and effective service to the conservative element at the Syracuse convention which prevented what threatened to become an embarrassing situation for the department; and that, considering all the circumstances, the department would not be stultifying itself, but could well afford to be charitable in these cases, and if not for the sake of the applicants themselves, then for the sake of those who are sponsors for them—the men who have stood by the department.

We have appealed for the reinstatement of these men only after earnestly considering the matter from the standpoint of the department, from the standpoint of the men, and from the standpoint of the service, and we are convinced from our knowledge of conditions in the field that our position is sound and that you will make no mistake in acting favorably upon these applications for reinstatement.

While our service was passing through its turbulent experiences of the past year the officers of the Railway Mail Association did not get under cover and excuse themselves on the ground that "This is the department's fight," but, on the contrary, in the face of bitter criticism, cutting insinuations, and the loss of friends and popularity, they rallied to the position taken by the department, and with all the influence and prestige they could command helped to fight off the danger of disorganization and disruption that threatened the service.

It would have been a great deal easier and far more popular to have remained quiet and inactive. It took more than an average degree of courage and faithfulness to stand out against the prevailing sentiment and preach patience and loyalty and meet the attacks of the militant movement. Men of that character do not consider serious propositions superficially, nor do they jump at conclusions hastily,

and when we advised the reinstatement of Messrs. Erwin and Quackenbush it was not a matter of mere sentiment with us. It was a matter of real moment to the department and to the service.

In the conflict that is raging between conservatism and radicalism we have fought for conservatism. We have advised that the proper and only effective way to promote the best interests of the service and the welfare of the men is by maintaining cordial relations and a healthy spirit of cooperation with the department. Another element within our service, encouraged and urged on by outside influences, insists that such a course is hopeless and that we must adopt a more independent and a more radical policy.

Our policy is now on trial. Developments are being watched and analyzed. We wish to demonstrate that our position is right and that any other policy must eventually lead to disappointment and grief. There has never been a time when there was greater need of a cooperative spirit in the service than now, and the existence or nonexistence of that spirit has never meant quite so much to the administration as it does now.

We do not only believe that the honorable Postmaster General desires the good will and cooperation of the postal employees, but believe he deserves it. We are anxious that he shall be favored with that confidence and esteem that he has earned and which should be his by right. We are ever ready to do our part toward that end. All we ask is a fair chance.

The Railway Mail Association has not faltered in its duty in the past, and she may reasonably be expected to measure up to requirements now, unless, indeed, the handicap should be too great.

Confident that you will receive this letter in the spirit in which it was written, I am,

Sincerely, yours, P. J. SCHARDT,
President, Railway Mail Association.

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INSPECTOR,
Washington, January 18, 1912.

I respectfully recommend that Charles H. Quackenbush, a railway postal clerk in the first (Boston) division, Railway Mail Service, who was dismissed from the service on March 31, 1911, be not reinstated and that his application now pending for reinstatement be given no further consideration. My reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

About the middle of February, 1911, A. C. Walton, a railway postal clerk in the first division and at that time president of an organization of railway postal clerks known as the Railway Mail Association, called upon Inspector in Charge Letherman, of the Boston division, and informed him that as the result of orders received from the General Superintendent Railway Mail Service as to the manner in which slack was to be taken up in the service widespread dissatisfaction had been engendered among the railway postal clerks to the extent, as he feared, of radical disloyalty and the proposed joining on the part of these radicals with the American

Federation of Labor. It appears that this latter organization before granting admission to applicants for membership requires a secret oath and that all other organizations affiliating with it pay tribute to the central organization. This central organization does not appear to be incorporated; is responsible to no laws and to no Government; in spite of the tremendous industrial, economical, and social influence which it asserts it manages its affairs without public accountability; its oligarchies raise and spend vast sums of money in ways of which the public has no knowledge; its operations are veiled in mystery and reach out to every part of the country. Therefore, the ultimate purpose of these railway postal clerks in making an attempt of any kind whatever to organize or affiliate with the American Federation of Labor is palpable.

In view of the above, and having in mind the best interests of the service as a whole, Inspector in Charge Letherman was fully justified in keeping a close watch on the situation.

On February 12 a meeting of the Railway Mail Association was held at Boston. Mr. Quackenbush was present at this meeting and the following is quoted from the resolutions passed:

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order which forbids the freedom of speech on the part of Government employees; we assert as American citizens engaged in Government service that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States to all citizens. We demand the rescinding of the order. * * *

Resolved, That we believe that our national executive committee should engage a competent person, who is not a Government employee, to represent our interests at times at Washington or elsewhere and that the per capita tax should be increased sufficiently to cover the salary of the same.

From an affidavit filed with the papers it will be noted that Railway Postal Clerk Tebbets swears that he was a member of the committee that was appointed from the floor at this meeting of February 12 to draft the above resolutions; that while a member of that committee he suggested that the word "request" be substituted for the word "demand;" whereupon Mr. Quackenbush stated that the President's order of January 31, 1902, as amended January 25, 1906, took from them their constitutional rights and that they were justified in demanding what rightfully belonged to them. Tebbets further swears that Quackenbush stated that "the language was none too strong and insisted that the word 'demand' should remain in." It appears that Quackenbush was a member of this committee and that it was his influence that controlled it.

Mr. George A. Wood, a Railway Mail Service employee and one of the strongest men in the entire service, who was for a period of years national secretary of the Railway Mail Association, swears that in that meeting Quackenbush publicly announced his conviction that a certain publication known as the Harpoon, which had been publishing articles of a violent and scurrilous character not based upon truth, should receive the support of all clerks and that at that time Quackenbush spoke with great earnestness in favor of the resolution. That Mr. Wood's testimony should be fully considered is evidenced by the fact that Quackenbush utilizes him in his own defense in making certain other statements regarding a controversy which occurred subsequently between himself and another railway postal clerk who was contending for an office in the Railway Mail Association. How-

ever, that contest has nothing to do with this case which bears entirely upon Quackenbush's attitude toward the department.

Special attention is called to the fact that in the papers there is an affidavit made by H. R. Stoddard, secretary of the first division, Railway Mail Association, in which he avers that "the attached are exact copies of a portion of the records of a meeting of the first division, Railway Mail Association, held February 12, 1911." The following is quoted from page eight of the copy of the minutes in question:

> Mr. Quackenbush moved that an exact copy of the resolutions be sent to the Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General, General Superintendent, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee and to the Railway Post Office. The question was brought up as to who was to send and sign them. Quakenbush added to his motion that the secretary of the association be ordered to transmit a copy of the resolutions to the persons named. Passed.

Quackenbush in his sworn statement to the department says that he "did not frame up or contribute a single one of these resolutions. However, attention is invited to the fact that he was a member of the committee which presented them to the main body of clerks for adoption. In the sworn statement he admits having made the motion to send copies to the Post Office Committee and to the Post Office. He convicts himself in this because that portion of the resolution which provided that a copy of the resolutions be forwarded to the chairman of the Post Office Committee was in violation of the Executive order of January 31, 1902, as amended January 25, 1906, which, in part, is as follows:

> All officers and employees of the United States * * * are hereby forbidden, either directly or indirectly, individually or through associations, to solicit an increase of pay or to influence or attempt to influence in their own interest any other legislation whatever, either before Congress or its committees, or in any way save through the heads of the departments or independent government establishments in or under which they serve, on penalty of dismissal from the Government service.

As information, I will state that the Railway Post Office mentioned in Quackenbush's motion is a publication which circulates widely among the railway postal clerks of the first division, Railway Mail Service.

It is submitted that if the resolutions quoted would not, in themselves, be sufficient grounds to warrant action against Quackenbush for disloyalty to the service and stirring up insubordination and strife, the unquestionable and indisputable proof of his having made the motion to refer these resolutions to the chairman of the Post Office Committee is absolute evidence that he clearly violated the Executive order mentioned above, the penalty for which is dismissal from the Government service, for which I hold that he should have been removed regardless of his subsequent actions which will hereinafter be covered in detail.

As evidence of the fact that this organization knew that Quackenbush's motion was ultra-radical, Mr. Stoddard, the secretary, admits that they were never forwarded by him to the department officers, and he is frank enough to say that they were of an insubordinate character.

In this connection, it might be stated that immediately following Quackenbush's suggestion that a copy of the resolutions be referred to the Post Office Committee, some one, the minutes do not show who,

moved that a copy be sent to the clerk of the Senate Post Office Committee by night message, presumably by telegraph.

Attention is also called to the fact that the minutes show that at that time a vote of thanks was suggested to Mr. Walters, the editor of the Harpoon, for "what he had done."

A few days following this radical and uncalled for action on the part of the railway postal clerks found Mr. Quackenbush in attendance, on February 26, at a conference or meeting, in company with a large number of his fellow clerks, with Mr. Frank McCarty, the organizer of the American Federation of Labor, whom Mr. Quackenbush refers to in his sworn statement of defense as a labor agitator. In this statement Quackenbush admits that he attended this meeting in Boston which was addressed by Mr. McCarty, and that he knew that McCarty had called the meeting, having sent out printed notices thereof, a copy of which is in the files of the case. The following is quoted from Quackenbush's sworn statement, which is in the files:

> At the time of holding this meeting your deponent believes that the clerks in this first division had not in any large numbers made up their minds one way or the other as to the advantage or disadvantage of joining any labor organization; that at the meeting your deponent took no conspicuous part; that after the labor agitator had addressed the meeting the different members began to offer questions; that there was more or less confusion, and that some one sitting near your deponent asked him if he would bring order out of chaos and have the clerks address their questions through him. This your deponent did, and took no part in the discussion one way or the other. When the question came up as to whether there should be a labor organization formed and motion was made to lay the matter over for two weeks while the clerks got together and gave the matter further attention, the motion to postpone was passed by a vote of about 14 to 11. Your deponent calls attention to the fact that only 7 clerks were needed to organize a union and that the 11 who voted against postponing the matter could have easily organized a union at that time, but that the 11 clerks who so voted were guided by the advice and by a consideration for the wishes of the other 14, and that a union was not organized at that time, and your deponent further says that the subject has not been considered since that time. Your deponent further says that since that time there has not been any agitation along this line. Your deponent further says that his position was definitely stated as directly opposed to affiliation with the American Federation of Labor in his circular letter to the clerks of the first division dated March 16, 1911, in which letter he announced his candidacy for the office of president.

It is submitted that the above statement—that he (Quackenbush) took no part in the discussion and that the clerks at that time asked him to state all the questions—constitutes an evasive statement and is absurd on its face. His own words are prima facie evidence of the fact that he was the leading spirit in the movement at that time. But the particular portion of the above quotation which is reprehensible is the last sentence, in which he leads the department to believe that the announcement of his candidacy for the office of president was made on March 16, 1911, when, as a matter of fact, the announcement occurred on March 9, 1911, three days before the meeting of the Railway Mail Association on March 12, at which time there was another meeting, held a few hours previous, which was called by Mr. McCarty, the labor organizer. This latter meeting was held at a different hall in the same city, and Quackenbush was in attendance, but he fails absolutely to refer, in any manner whatever in his entire statement of defense filed with the department, to this gathering. I propose to show elsewhere in this statement why Quackenbush did not state in his original announcement of March 9 of his candidacy for presidency that he was not in favor of affiliating with the American Federation of Labor, and to demonstrate clearly

that the reason was that his first plan was to make his announcement and through another scheme, which he had concocted in conjunction with a discharged clerk by the name of Slocum, to try and capture the meeting of the clerks of March 12, which he succeeded in doing, and after which there was no necessity for the organization joining the American Federation of Labor; hence, in order to gain votes for his position of president he issues the second circular of March 16 and leads the department to believe from his sworn statement that it was in this circular that he first announced his candidacy for the office of president.

In his announcement of March 9 Quackenbush uses the following language: "I accept and indorse every word of the resolutions adopted at the meeting of February 12."

I now wish to call your special attention to the meeting of March 12, referred to above, which was held with Mr. McCarty, the organizer of the American Federation of Labor. The following is quoted from the affidavit of Railway Postal Clerk Tebbets:

> (Tebbets) met a reporter at the top of the stairs and was informed by him that the meeting had adjourned until after the meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association which was being held in Castle Hall on Tremont Street at the same hour. He said Mr. Quackenbush and about a dozen other clerks had been there but had only remained a few minutes and had gone over to the other meeting and were all coming back after the other meeting had closed.

Mr. Tebbets further swears that he got a printed notice of this meeting, signed by Mr. McCarty, which states that it was called for the purpose of interesting clerks in becoming affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and that he got there one hour late, the meeting having been called at 4 p. m.

I desire to state here that the reason in my opinion that Mr. Quackenbush and those clerks who were following his radical leadership failed to return and confer with Mr. McCarty was due to the fact that he (Quackenbush) was successful in passing certain resolutions of a radical nature at the meeting of railway postal clerks which was held on the same date. This action demonstrated to him that there was no necessity for him to be forced in his radicalism to join the American Federation of Labor at that particular time, when his own element had bright prospects of capturing the Railway Mail Association, thereby placing himself and his friends in control and securing his election to the office of president. Three days before this meeting of March 12 was called he had, in a printed circular, announced his candidacy, and four days after it, when he had succeeded in sounding the sentiment among his fellow clerks, he issued the letter declining to affiliate with the American Federation of Labor. I now ask you to consider whether Quackenbush and his associates would or would not have returned and taken further action in connection with McCarty had the resolutions which he and his radical friends supported at the meeting of March 12 of the Railway Mail Association been acted upon unfavorably. Attention is also called to the fact that the reporter, mentioned in the statement of Tebbets, refers only to Quackenbush, which is given for what it is worth, but it at least indicates the fact that Quackenbush was considered by the newspaper reporters of Boston as a leader in this movement. Inspector in Charge Letherman submits a facing slip which he is certain is in the handwriting of Quackenbush, reading as follows:

On March 12 at 4 p. m., Central Labor Union Rooms, 873 Washington Street, Boston. Meeting. (All invited.)

What transpired at the meeting of March 12 of the Railway Mail Association now becomes of vital importance in connection with the attitude of Quackenbush toward the department and his superior officers. H. F. French, a railway postal clerk, one of the leading supporters of Quackenbush, and a man who, in my opinion, has been engaged in stirring up strife among the clerks of the first division, whose conduct was to a large extent reprehensible, and whose friendship for Quackenbush can not be doubted, makes oath as follows:

I do hereby swear that the attached are the complete records of the meeting of the First Division Railway Mail Association held March 12, 1911.

From the minutes of this meeting, made by Mr. French, I quote the following:

On presentation of the case of the removal from the service of Mr. Slocum by (Quackenbush) it was moved and seconded that the rules be suspended and Mr. Slocum allowed the floor. * * * Quackenbush asked for advice relative to the removal of Mr. Slocum. * * * Stated that Mr. Canfield would take up the matter if presented to him. * * *

The following resolution was offered by Quackenbush:

Resolved, That whereas the general superintendent has summarily removed from the service Harry E. Slocum, we feel that in order that we as clerks may conduct ourselves in a manner wholly acceptable to the department that the reasons for the dismissal of this clerk be given publicity.

On motion of Quackenbush and seconded this resolution was adopted.

Mr. Slocum took the floor and read the following resolution, which he asked to have substituted for the one which was just adopted:

Whereas one of our members has been removed and whereas no charges were brought, no defense allowed, and appeal not granted, and whereas said member is willing to prove that his conduct was not detrimental to the welfare of the service; be it, therefore,

Resolved, That we members of the First Division Railway Mail Association do hereby protest against such action and demand that this member be given a hearing before the proper officers, said member to have counsel to defend him against any charges that may be brought.

Quackenbush withdrew his resolution in favor of the one offered by Slocum.

After discussing the changing of the word "demand" to the word "request," the motion as presented by Mr. Slocum was adopted by a yea and nay vote.

In his sworn statement to the department and through his attorney in his personal pleadings with the officers of the department, Quackenbush attempts to create the impression that the original minutes of the meeting, as quoted above, by the secretary were incorrect, and he submits as evidence thereof the following from Mr. H. R. Stoddard, who signs himself as secretary, First Division Railway Mail Association:.

BOSTON, MASS., *May 31, 1911.*

C. H. QUACKENBUSH,
President, First Division Railway Mail Association, Stamford, Conn.

MY DEAR QUACKENBUSH: The following is a copy of that part of the minutes of the meeting of March 12, 1911, relative to the withdrawal of the resolution offered by you. The original minutes read as follows: "Mr. Quackenbush withdrew his resolution in favor of the one just offered by Mr. Slocum." The minutes as they were unanimously amended at the meeting of May 21, when the minutes of the March 12 meeting were read, read as follows: "The president asked Mr. Quackenbush if he would withdraw his resolution; he, Quackenbush, said yes, if the meeting so desire, or words to that effect."

Yours, frat., H. R. STODDARD,
Secretary, First Division Railway Mail Association.

I beg to state that Mr. Quackenbush's attorney was present at the meeting of May 21 and it was upon his advice and suggestion, or counsel, either directly or indirectly, that the minutes of the meeting of March 12 were deliberately changed for the purpose of assisting Mr. Quackenbush in making as favorable an appeal before the department as possible. As proof of the fact that the original minutes taken from the affidavit of Stoddard are true and correct, I call attention to an affidavit made by H. F. French, referred to above, the leading advocate and friend of Quackenbush, in which he admits that Quackenbush offered the first resolution regarding Slocum and then accepted Slocum's substitute which contained the words "protest" and "demand."

The meeting of May 21, at which the minutes were changed to suit the cause of Mr. Quackenbush, was devoted almost entirely to devising means for obtaining Mr. Quackenbush's reinstatement. In the papers is an affidavit from George A. Wood, national secretary of the Railway Mail Association, and one of the strongest men in the service, who swears that he was present at the meeting of March 12 and that Mr. Quackenbush, after a whispered consultation and conference with Mr. Slocum, offered his resolution, and that Slocum then offered his as a substitute, whereupon Quackenbush withdrew his original. Mr. Wood further swears that Quackenbush made a public speech at that time for the adoption of the substitute; the affiant uses the following language:

> His (Quackenbush) attitude was such as to tend to spread discord and insubordination among railway postal clerks.

The consultation and conference between Quackenbush and Slocum were evidently for the purpose of arranging between themselves how the matter could best be presented without the department being in a position to dismiss the former from the service for using language such as was contained in the resolution which was finally passed. Therefore, in my judgment, the consultation between Quackenbush and Slocum resulted in the former showing his sympathy for the latter and resentfulness and officiousness toward the department by introducing a resolution which is somewhat temperately drawn and then having Slocum introduce the bitter, denunciatory one, followed by his withdrawing the original resolution. By this means he created the opinion in the minds of those present that he viewed favorably the Slocum resolution and at the same time he could not be accused of being the author thereof.

In order to understand fully the lengths to which Mr. Quackenbush went in this matter and the influence for evil that his conduct must have had among his associates, it is necessary at this point to consider the reasons for the dismissal from the service of Railway Postal Clerk Harry E. Slocum, on March 6, 1911, which action was taken upon the recommendation of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, who used the following language in a communication to you under date of March 2:

> This appears to be a public declaration made to railway postal clerks of his (Slocum) approval of flagrant violation of the Executive order which he publicly declares against.

The Second Assistant Postmaster General states in this letter that Slocum instigated a move to thank the Harpoon for its work and to

solicit subscriptions for the paper, and also takes Slocum to task for his personal advocacy of the employment of a competent person outside of the civil service to represent the interests of the railway postal clerks at Washington or elsewhere. I have made a personal examination of the files in connection with the removal of Slocum, and say, without fear of contradiction, that there is not a scintilla of absolute proof as to this clerk's misconduct nor a report of an inspector, such as has been submitted in the case against Quackenbush, and yet Quackenbush's conduct is decidedly more reprehensible than that of Slocum on account of the wider influence which he had and the vigorous manner in which he led his forces. The memorandum of the Second Assistant Postmaster General is based on the mere statement of Superintendent Ryan that, from what he could ascertain, Slocum was the principal offender in the articles appearing in the Boston papers denouncing the Postmaster General and the department. Superintendent Ryan submits no proof or affidavits, and says: "Slocum is reported to have leanings toward anarchism." On these mere assertions, which, in my opinion, are undoubtedly true, the Second Assistant Postmaster General recommends Slocum's dismissal. The Second Assistant Postmaster General further states: "His (Slocum's) conduct tends to unjustly foster discontent and criticisms of the department among the clerks, and is detrimental to the welfare of the service." This position on the part of the Second Assistant Postmaster General is believed to be thoroughly justified. The passage at this meeting of the Railway Mail Association of the discourteous and insubordinate resolutions quoted above demonstrated unquestionably to Quackenbush and his friend H. E. Slocum, at that time dismissed from the service for doing precisely what Quackenbush was engaged in, that it was unnecessary to affiliate with the American Federation of Labor for the purpose of causing greater strife and discord in the service, because Quackenbush had every reason to believe that he would be elected president of the association at the election following. Therefore I am justified in believing that it was unnecessary for him to return for further conference that evening with the representative of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. McCarty.

In the meantime, the facts which I have recorded above were brought to the attention of the administrative officers of the department in a report from Inspector-in-Charge Letherman, to which I attached a recommendation for the removal from the service of Mr. Quackenbush for similar reasons given in the recommendation of the Second Assistant Postmaster General for the dismissal of Slocum; the only difference being that the proof of Quackenbush's attitude and his determination to stir up strife is absolute and overwhelming as compared with the evidence in the papers on file in the case of Slocum.

Mr. Quackenbush was removed from the service March 31, 1911, on my recommendation, and the statement which he makes in his defense and submits to the department to the effect that his removal had something to do with the contest then pending for the election of president of the Railway Mail Association is a deliberate falsehood, positively known by me to be such, for the reason that this office, since I have been chief inspector has steadfastly maintained the position of not recognizing any association of any character in the postal service in making investigations, holding that all complaints

of every kind which are made by associations in their own interests must resolve themselves, to a more or less extent, into an inquiry of the conduct of the postal officer. This has been my course in the past; it is the only safe course to pursue in the future, and I am in position to swear positively that Quackenbush's statement in this respect is absolutely false. I have no interest in Mr. Walton whom he defeated for the presidency, either directly or indirectly. He (Walton) was present at a meeting of railway postal clerks in your office one evening, at which time I considered his arrogant attitude toward you to be almost insulting; I think you will recall the occasion. As further evidence of the fact that Walton's candidacy could not have influenced the inspectors in the slightest in this instance, it is pointed out that Mr. Walton, early in February, gave Inspector-in-Charge Letherman the information regarding the feeling among the clerks and the sentiment existing for a proposed affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, while Mr. Quackenbush did not become a candidate for the position of president until March 9, 1911.

On October 28, 1911, P. J. Schardt, who signs himself as president of the Railway Mail Association, addressed to me as chief inspector, a letter in which he used the following language:

> The stain of removal and the mental anguish suffered by Quackenbush precludes the thought that he would ever again be guilty of a similar mistake; that the distressing experience through which he has passed will make of him a living warning against similar missteps by the younger element in the service.

This letter was answered with the simple statement that it had been referred to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, and I call your attention to it now in order that you may see from the language used that Mr. Schardt, the president of the association, recognizes the fact that Quackenbush's conduct was not justifiable and that he desires his reinstatement in the service in order that it may be a living warning against similar mistakes by the younger element. In answer to this, attention is invited to the fact that the firm attitude on your part in refusing to reinstate Mr. Quackenbush has been all the living warning that is necessary to stop further disloyalty in that section.

The manipulations which have occurred in the Railway Mail Association have been for the control of the conventions, which are held annually, and this feature has played a considerable part in the attempt now being made by the president of this association to force the reinstatement of Quackenbush, if possible. While I have no evidence to show that any deal existed, either directly or indirectly, between Quackenbush and Schardt who was elected president at the last convention, I believe I am justified in making the suggestion to you that you should consider whether Quackenbush, having been unexpectedly dismissed from the service for insubordination and subsequently elected president of his division association, was not in an attitude where, after having employed an attorney and making public statements to the effect that he proposed to be reinstated and issuing a printed request on the association to contribute money to assist in his reinstatement, maintenance, fight, and the payment of his attorney, did not enter into a deal of some kind with the present organization officers of the national association Railway Mail Association, who were recently elected, for the purpose of supporting them temporarily if they in turn would use their influence on the Second Assistant Postmaster General, and through him on you, for the purpose of securing

his reinstatement. This disloyal railway postal clerk now finds himself in the ridiculous position of having been dismissed from the service for conduct unbecoming a faithful employee and at the same time holding the position of president of the association. He undoubtedly realizes that by no process of reasoning would he, in his present condition, have any influence with departmental officers in looking after and protecting the interests of the railway postal clerks, a thing for which the association seems to have been organized rather than for the purpose of promoting the service as a whole. I feel somewhat justified in making the above statement for the reason that on August 29, 1911, after Mr. Stewart had attended the national convention of Railway Postal Clerks and was made cognizant of the fact that Quackenbush was cooperating with Schardt and the present organization of the association, he submits to you a memorandum regarding Quackenbush in which he uses the following language:

> While he (Quackenbush) insists that his purpose was only to secure from the department a definite statement regarding causes for removal, nevertheless his action gave support to the impropriety of the Slocum resolution.

He further states:

> I believe that while Quackenbush was not without fault in the premises, the best interests of the service would be conserved by a further consideration of his case and by his restoration to the service.

The Second Assistant Postmaster General justifies his position largely on the ground that Quackenbush submitted to him written statements of Superintendent Ryan and certain chief clerks which he says are worthy of serious consideration. The letter of Superintendent Ryan and his chief clerks is as follows:

> We, the undersigned, being supervisory officials of the first division, Railway Mail Service, and formerly associates of Mr. Charles H. Quackenbush in this service, understand that it is your wish to have an expression from us as to the conduct of Mr. Quackenbush while in this service, beg to respectfully state that, to the best of our knowledge, he has always conducted himself in a gentlemanly and orderly manner and has not been a trouble maker or an organizer of strife and discord among his fellow clerks.

I submit to you the question of why Mr. Ryan should make a certificate of that character in the case of Mr. Quackenbush, when the newspapers were commenting on his attitude toward the department and the continual strife, while in the case of Harry Slocum, whose conduct was not nearly so reprehensible, he has no hesitancy in stating that he understands that he is an anarchist, on which statement he is dismissed from the service..

It is apparent that the position of Mr. Ryan as between the Quackenbush case and that of Slocum is evidence of the fact that he is either afraid of the power and influence which Quackenbush's insubordination has brought around him, due to his incompetency to handle the division properly and discipline the clerks, or he is manifestly out of sympathy with the efforts of the department to promote discipline in the service and secure the obeyance of the rules and regulations promulgated under acts of Congress and orders issued by the President of the United States.

I further contend that a reading of the reports of post-office inspectors who recently investigated Mr. Ryan will convince you of the absolute incompetency of this officer to handle any situation that requires administrative ability. At the time these reports were submitted I

was somewhat fearful that their conclusions were severe, notwithstanding the fact that I cautioned the inspectors to lean toward the conservative in making their report, but after having read the report of the committee of five able and conscientious officers who recently investigated the various railway mail service divisions I am convinced that the inspectors should have made their reports stronger, and I respectfully call your attention to the remarks contained in that report regarding Superintendent Ryan, his assistant superintendent, and the various chief clerks who signed the letter addressed to the Second Assistant Postmaster General, on which he places so much strength in making his recommendation to you for the reinstatement of Mr. Quackenbush.

I differ very radically with the Second Assistant Postmaster General in his statement in his memorandum to you that the best interests of the service would be conserved by the restoration therein of Mr. Quackenbush. I believe that his reinstatement would seal a deal which exists between Quackenbush and the organization of the Railway Mail Association, as at present constituted, and I recommend that you do not become a party thereto, either directly or indirectly, by restoring him to the service. My opinion is that to avoid discontent in the service a premium should not be placed on disloyalty, but that the entire First Division Railway Mail Service should be reorganized with officers who will enforce discipline and give all the clerks justice. You will see the point in this suggestion when I say that Quackenbush lays great stress on the fact that the Second Assistant Postmaster General made the suggestion to his attorney that he should obtain a statement from his fellow clerks that he had never instigated strife or was insubordinate, etc. His lawyer sent out over 1,050 blanks to the clerks of the division and notwithstanding the fact that in the presidential election Quackenbush received over 500 votes, there were only 426 replied to the circulars received and filed at the department. In only 298 of these statements do the parties make the admission that they are personally acquainted with Mr. Quackenbush; 128 say that they never met him. There are an astonishingly large number of the 426 clerks who answer the question with the simple statement, "I do not know," which I believe is absolutely honest, but I submit that the clerks who answer the question with the word "No," when they have no personal knowledge of this man or his character, can not be good witnesses for Mr. Quackenbush, as they are not cognizant of and could not possibly pass upon the actions of Quackenbush at the meetings of February 12 and 26, and March 12.

I feel that if you act favorably upon the application of Quackenbush for reinstatement you can only in justice pursue the same course in the case of Slocum, who will, no doubt, make application for reinstatement. If Quackenbush is reinstated, Slocum will be in a position to show that his conduct was not as bad, on the whole, as that of Quackenbush.

The past record of Quackenbush convinces me that he is so constituted tempermentally as to be, by nature, a malcontent. You will find in the papers in the case an affidavit made by J. H. Haskison, a railway postal clerk, to the effect that he was sitting in company with Quackenbush and a clerk by the name of Strong in the dormitory, under the control of the superintendent Railway Mail Service,

when Quackenbush suddenly interrupted the conversation and jumped up from the table and struck Strong, blacking his eye. Haskison swears that there was no occasion for this demonstration of force and that he made this statement to Quackenbush. There is also inclosed an affidavit from Clerk Strong, who admits reluctantly that the attack was made by Quackenbush while he was sitting down, and the clerk uses the following expression in attempting to mitigate the offense:

> He (Quackenbush) had been drinking some at the time. I think at the time he attacked me he had had three or four mugs of sterling ale.

In the papers in the case you will find a report from Post Office Inspector O'Brien, in which he shows that Quackenbush permitted himself to get into a controversy with a driver of a mail wagon in New York City, which resulted in Quackenbush receiving a thorough chastisement at the hands of this driver, who was said to be very much smaller than the railway postal clerk.

But the incident which impresses me the most is his call at this office in company with his attorney for the purpose of stating his case. I had, from my knowledge of the facts in the case, become convinced that Quackenbush was hot-tempered, and when I directed my questions regarding his conduct to him in a kind and gentlemanly way he lost his temper to such an extent that his attorney had to remind him that he was conducting his case, whereupon he showed the greatest ill-temper toward his attorney, for which the latter offered me an apology. I told the attorney that this instance was a physical demonstration of the utter inability of the man to keep his temper and maintain a level head.

After considering all of the facts stated above, I wish to call your special attention to the following civil-service rule governing the reinstatement of employees:

> A departmant in proposing the reinstatement of an employee removed for delinquency or misconduct should state that the charges were not true; that they did not justify removal or that a similar punishment would not in general be imposed for a similar offense.

As a similar punishment was imposed on Clerk Slocum for an offense similar to that of Quackenbush, it is apparent that this statement can not be consistently made.

Before the reinstatement of Quackenbush can be made it will be necessary for you, through your subordinate officers, to make the statement quoted above, and I submit that in view of the evidence in the case it can not be consistently done. On the contrary, believing that the best interests of the service were cared for at the time Quackenbush was dismissed therefrom, I now renew my recommendation that he be not reinstated. No doubt very great efforts will be made to have him reinstated at once in view of the fact that on March 31 his period of eligibility expires.

I regret exceedingly the necessity for making a comparison between the Quackenbush and the Slocum cases, but in view of the statements made by the Second Assistant Postmaster General regarding both of these former clerks I have taken the liberty of writing at length with reference to them, knowing as I do his tender-heartedness and believing that he is full of the milk of human kindness and that he will accept it in the proper spirit, for my statements are not, in any

sense of the word, intended to reflect on him, but merely to exemplify the fact that in my opinion Quackenbush and his friends and new allies among the officers of the Railway Mail Association have entered into a combination to impose upon the sympathetic nature of Mr. Stewart.

R. J. KEMP, *Chief Inspector.*

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

MARCH 11, 1912.

I have considered very carefully the accompanying papers relating to the case of Charles H. Quackenbush, formerly a railway postal clerk in the first division, who was removed from the service on March 31, 1911, and whose application for reinstatement is now pending.

The civil-service rule governing the reinstatement of employees removed for cause is as follows:

> The department in proposing the reinstatement of an employee removed for delinquency or misconduct should state that the charges were not true; that they did not justify removal; or that a similar punishment would not in general be imposed for a similar offense.

In view of this regulation the charges involved in the removal of Quackenbush must be considered to determine (1) whether they were substantiated by facts and (2) whether, even though they were proved, the punishment inflicted was commensurate with the offense.

Quackenbush was removed for insubordination and disloyalty to the service and because he was a disturbing element among the clerks in the New England section.

Bearing out these charges the record shows:

1. That at a meeting of the Railway Mail Association held at Boston on February 12, 1911, Quackenbush led an attack on the Executive order of January 31, 1902, as amended January 25, 1906, which reads in part as follows:

> All officers and employees of the United States * * * are hereby forbidden, either directly or indirectly, individually or through associations, to solicit an increase in pay or to influence or attempt to influence in their own interest any other legislation whatever, either before Congress or its committees, or in any way save through the heads of the departments or independent Government establishments in or under which they serve, on penalty of dismissal from the Government service.

It is shown conclusively by copies of the proceedings at this meeting and the affidavits of clerks who were present that Quackenbush was largely responsible for and materially assisted in securing the adoption of a resolution demanding that the order be rescinded. The resolution further advocated that the national executive committee of the several railway mail associations should engage a competent person not in the employ of the Government to represent the railway postal clerks at Washington and elsewhere, and should levy a per capita tax to pay the salary of such a person. During the meeting Quackenbush with great earnestness urged the clerks to support the Harpoon which at that time was attacking the department in a vicious manner.

2. That at this meeting of February 12 Quackenbush was guilty of conduct that was directly in violation of the Executive order mentioned. The minutes of the meeting, a copy of which appears in the record, show that Quackenbush presented a motion, which was adopted,

providing that "an exact copy of the resolutions be sent to the Postmaster General, Second Assistant Postmaster General, general superintendent, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee, and to the Railway Post Office." The action contemplated by this motion was not only in defiance of the department but authorized a specific violation of the Executive order by communicating directly with the chairman of the Post Office Committee. The copies of the resolutions were not sent, the reason being that the secretary of the association, who was instructed to take this action, appears to have been afraid to do so because of the insubordinate character of the language of the resolution. The secretary's failure to follow his instructions in no way minimizes the offense of Quackenbush.

3. That Quackenbush was the leader in a movement to unionize the clerks of the first division in affiliation with the American Federation of Labor. The success of such a movement necessarily required that the clerks be aroused to such a degree of discontentment and disloyalty to the service that they would be willing to desert the Railway Mail Association, already recognized by the department. The call for one of the meetings to consider this action was made by Quackenbush in his own handwriting, and it is not disputed that on February 26, 1911, he and a large number of his fellow clerks attended a conference with Frank McCarty, an organizer of the American Federation of Labor. With reference to this meeting Quackenbush states that he took no part in the discussion. Exactly the contrary is shown to be the fact. Quackenbush became the spokesman for the clerks and was their recognized leader. In his defense Quackenbush tried to take credit for the fact that no union was formed. It is plain from the record that no credit is due on this account, because Quackenbush was following two distinct lines of action, so that if one failed he could carry the other to completion. He desired the presidency of the Railway Mail Association, which he succeeded in obtaining, and it was only after he found that he and his supporters were in control of the association that he abandoned the movement to unionize the clerks, which appears to have progressed to a point only short of actual organization.

The foregoing accusations are proved by the evidence contained in the record. Several other facts are established which do not bear directly on the offense for which Quackenbush was removed, but nevertheless show his ugly temperament. On one occasion he appears to have attacked a fellow clerk in a manner that was very cowardly. At another time he provoked a fight with a mail driver, in which he was worsted. He also displayed his lack of self-control at a personal interview in the office of the chief inspector, his conduct being such that his attorney found it necessary to reprove him for his actions.

In this connection it may also be mentioned that at a meeting of the Railway Mail Association held on March 12, 1911, Quackenbush championed the cause of Harry E. Slocum, a railway postal clerk, who was removed from the service on March 6, 1911. At this meeting a resolution was adopted criticizing the department for removing Slocum without a hearing, and Quackenbush had much to do with its adoption. In my opinion no special importance should be attached to this incident, because the action of the clerks who favored the resolution is susceptible of the explanation that they desired to obtain from the department such information as would guide them so as not to commit a similar offense.

Referring to the civil-service rule above quoted, the charges against Quackenbush are clearly shown to have been true. In a brief review of the case it is impossible to state all the circumstances which must necessarily receive consideration in determining the degree of punishment merited by his offense. Having read carefully, however, the evidence offered both for and against him, and having reviewed a large number of other cases growing out of the recent reorganization of the Railway Mail Service, I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that, with the exception of the cases involving a violation of a criminal statute of the United States, there was none in which removal from the service was more deserved than in this instance. Taking the most liberal view of his offense, I believe the department is unable to say that the removal of Quackenbush was not justified or that the same punishment would not be inflicted on any other employee who might be found guilty of a similar offense. The chief inspector's memorandum of January 18, 1912, in which this case is exhaustively reviewed, is to some extent conjectural, but in its essential points is based on proof contained in the records, and in my opinion the recommendation against the reinstatement of Quackenbush should be approved.

Respectfully submitted.

A. L. DAVIS.

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 13, 1912.

Complying with your direction to state wherein, in my opinion, the statements made by Mr. Davis in the Quackenbush case as to the facts which he believes are proven by the record are incorrect, I have the honor to submit the following:

Mr. Davis's memorandum states causes for removal of Mr. Quackenbush and says that the record shows—

(1) That at a meeting of the Railway Mail Association, held at Boston February 12, 1911, Quackenbush led an attack on the Executive order, and that it is shown conclusively by copies of the proceedings and the affidavits of clerks who were present that Quackenbush was largely responsible for and materially assisted in securing the adoption of a resolution demanding that the order be rescinded.

In my opinion this statement is entirely too strong. I do not find evidence that he led an attack. The minutes of the meeting mention his name but twice, and then in connection with a motion to send a copy of the resolutions to officers of the department and the Post Office Committee. However, it is shown by the affidavit of Tebbetts that in the committee that drafted the resolutions Quackenbush was responsible for the substitution of the word "demand" for "request;" and George A. Wood, in an affidavit, says that Quackenbush was present at the meeting and spoke upon many questions, including the resolution referred to. On the other hand, Quackenbush, in his affidavit submitted at the hearing accorded him last summer, states that the resolutions were brought into the meeting by a committee which consisted of about 15 men, of whom he was one; that he was not chairman of the committee; that he did not move that a committee on resolutions be appointed

to retire; that he did not go to the meeting of February 12 nor did he retire with the committee with a single one of the resolutions in mind; that he did not frame up or contribute a single one of the resolutions; that he did not know at the time he went to the meeting or retired with the committee that the committee would report a single one of the resolutions or that they were to be discussed; that the resolutions were passed unanimously, and that in the discussion as to their disposition he moved that a copy be sent to the officers of the department and the Post Office Committee.

The resolution which is referred to as an attack on the Executive order was a paragraph among others following a statement that the first division, Railway Mail Service, had reason to be dissatisfied with the conditions then existing in the service and was a protest against the Executive order, but was not couched in respectful terms. It was as follows:

Resolved, That we protest against the Executive order, which forbids freedom of speech on the part of Government employees. We assert as American citizens engaged in public service that we are entitled to the benefits conferred by the Constitution of the United States upon all citizens, and we demand the rescission of this order.

Mr. Davis's memorandum further states in this connection that the resolution further advocated that the national executive committee of the Railway Mail Association should engage a competent person not in the employ of the Government to represent them at Washington, etc. There is a paragraph in the resolutions to that effect, but the statement or inference that Mr. Quackenbush was largely responsible for and materially assisted in securing its adoption is not sustained by the record.

Mr. Davis's memorandum further states in this connection that Mr. Quackenbush with great earnestness urged the clerks to support the Harpoon, etc.

The only affirmative evidence tending to establish this is found in the affidavit of Mr. Wood, who says that Quackenbush announced publicly his conviction that the publication called the Harpoon was conducting an open and fearless fight for the railway postal clerks and that it should receive the support of all clerks. Upon the other hand the minutes of the meeting show that a motion was made and carried that a vote of thanks be extended to Mr. Walter, the editor of the Harpoon, for what he had done; but they do not show that Quackenbush made the motion or that there was any discussion upon the subject, while they do show discussion upon other motions and resolutions before they were acted upon. Furthermore, Henry R. Branchaud states in his affidavit that he was well acquainted with Quackenbush and roomed in the same dormitory, and that he had heard Quackenbush denounce the methods employed by the Harpoon on numerous occasions; and Mr. Quackenbush, in his affidavit, swears that he has never indorsed or approved the Harpoon; that he never contributed any material to it; that he subscribed for the same for himself, but has never solicited subscriptions of others; that when he was about to send in his own subscription he stated that fact before other clerks in his crew and that certain clerks sent their subscriptions together, securing a club rate; that he did not urge others to send their subscriptions, recommend that they do so, or advise them in any way; and that he has publicly denounced the idea of making the Harpoon the association's medium.

Mr. Davis's memorandum states further that the report shows—

(2) That at the meeting of February 12 Quackenbush was guilty of conduct that was directly in violation of the Executive order mentioned, and bases this upon the fact that Quackenbush presented a motion providing for the sending of a copy of the resolutions to the chairman of the Post Office Committee.

I think the statement and inference are rather broader and stronger than the facts would justify, as an attempt to influence legislation in the clerks' behalf is not otherwise evidenced; therefore, the conclusion stated must rest solely upon this act.

Mr. Davis's memorandum states further that the report shows—

(3) That Quackenbush was the leader in a movement to unionize the clerks of the first division in affiliation with the American Federation of Labor; that the call for one of the meetings to consider this action was made by Quackenbush in his own handwriting; and that at the meeting of February 26 Quackenbush became the spokesman of the clerks and was their recognized leader.

I do not think the record shows that Mr. Quackenbush was the leader in a movement to unionize the clerks or that he called the meeting of February 26, 1911. They show that Mr. Quackenbush was a leader of one faction of clerks in the Railway Mail Association of the First Division and that Mr. Walton, at that time the president of that branch, was a leader of the other faction, and it is well known that these two factions were striving for ascendency; that there was a movement in Boston, as at other points in the United States about that time, by the agents of the American Federation of Labor to induce the clerks to organize and affiliate; that Quackenbush was one of 25 clerks present at the meeting on February 26 at which McCarty, the organizer for the American Federation of Labor, explained his purposes; that at that meeting Quackenbush ultimately put the questions to McCarty which the clerks wished answered. A certain facing slip, which is said to have been a call for the meeting, is in the record, the handwriting of which is claimed by the inspectors to be that of Quackenbush.

Mr. Quackenbush, in his affidavit, swears that he attended the meeting; that there were about 25 railway postal clerks present; that the meeting had been called by McCarty, and as far as he knew, was not called by any railway postal clerk; that he did not ask McCarty or anyone connected with the American Federation of Labor to address the clerks; that he had absolutely nothing to do in any way with the holding of the meeting; that he did not urge or ask any clerk to attend; that he did not know the meeting was to be held until he had reached Boston the day of the holding of the meeting and saw a notice posted; that he attended the meeting without any knowledge of what was going to be said or done and without intending to take an active part; that he had not intended prior to the meeting to join the labor organization and had not made up his mind whether it would be advantageous; that there was no general demand on the part of the clerks for such organization; that at the meeting he took no conspicuous part; that after McCarty had addressed the meeting different members began to offer questions and that someone suggested for orderly procedure that the clerks address their questions through him, Quackenbush, and that this was done, but that he took no part in the discussion; that the meeting decided by a vote of about

14 to 11 to lay the matter over for two weeks while the clerks got together and gave it further attention; that only 7 clerks were necessary to organize a union; that the subject has not been considered since that time, nor has there been any agitation along that line; and that he stated his position definitely as opposed to affiliation with the American Federation of Labor in his circular letter announcing his candidacy for the office of president of the first division of the association.

Mr. Branchaud, in his affidavit, states that on numerous occasions he has heard Mr. Quackenbush urge strongly against affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, etc.; and Mr. Stoddard, the secretary of the First Division Association, in letter of May 8, 1911, addressed Mr. Quackenbush, states that to the best of his knowledge he never heard Quackenbush mention the American Federation of Labor, and that Quackenbush's only position in the matter so far as his knowledge went, was the one made known in his public announcement of candidacy for president of the First Division of the Railway Mail Association.

A comparison of the handwriting on the facing slip, with the exhibited handwriting of Quackenbush, does not suggest to me any similarity.

As to the other statements contained in Mr. Davis's paragraph on this subject as to the motives and purposes of Quackenbush in the premises they are mere conjectures or inferences and are not evidenced by the record.

In Mr. Davis's next paragraph he states: "The foregoing accusations are proved by the evidence contained in the record." This is, in my judgment, inaccurate to the extent to which I have above shown.

Mr. Davis's memorandum further states that there are other facts which do not bear directly on the offense for which Quackenbush was removed, but which, nevertheless, show his "ugly temperament." The instances cited are far from proving the statement. The first is said to be that of an attack on a fellow clerk in a manner that was "very cowardly." This attack was upon a clerk named Strong, and he has submitted an affidavit giving the details of the occurrence which happened three or four years ago. In a passage of remarks between them Strong finally made a remark which was resented by Quackenbush, who struck him and, as Strong says, as he did so said, "That remark is an insult to my wife." Strong further says, "In justice to the said Quackenbush, I hereby state that I do not blame him for attacking me, for I feel that he thought he was entirely justified."

Another instance is stated to be that he provoked a fight with a mail driver. Although an effort was made to find the driver he could not be located, as the occurrence is said to have been 10 or 11 years ago. If it did happen there is nothing whatever in the record to show the circumstances under which it occurred. A railway postal clerk named John Halloran states that he recalls that about 10 or 11 years ago Quackenbush did have trouble with a mail-wagon driver at the Grand Central Depot and became involved in a fist fight; that the matter had almost entirely passed out of his mind; and that he could not give any of the details or remember the name of the driver or

what provoked the trouble. He says Quackenbush was not drinking at the time.

Mr. Davis's memorandum further mentions the relations of Quackenbush to the Slocum resolution. Mr. Quackenbush offered the resolution at the meeting of March 12 in the nature of an inquiry with reference to the Slocum dismissal. There was nothing objectionable about it. Afterward Slocum secured its withdrawal and the substitution of one which he offered, which was, in a measure, objectionable. Mr. Davis says that in his opinion no special importance should be attached to the incident for reasons which he states and with which I agree, except that I think the facts show clearly that Quackenbush's intentions were merely to secure information.

I have confined this memorandum, as requested, to the statement of points of difference between my opinion and the statements in Mr. Davis's memorandum regarding the facts in the case.

It should be observed that the very large part of this evidence mentioned which bears favorably upon the claims of Mr. Quackenbush is new evidence and was not before the department at the time of his removal.

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

[Memorandum for the Postmaster General.]

MARCH 16, 1912.

With reference to Mr. Stewart's memorandum of the 13th instant on the Quackenbush case, I beg to submit the following:

[Association meeting of February 12, 1911.]

Mr. Stewart characterizes as "entirely too strong" my conclusion that Quackenbush "led an attack on the Executive order," and "was largely responsible for and materially assisted in securing the adoption of a resolution demanding that the order be rescinded."

Among the papers in the case is an affidavit of Herbert F. Tebbetts, who was present at the meeting of February 12, and was a member of the committee on resolutions. The affidavit states as follows:

It was desired by the committee that this order should be rescinded and it was proposed by Mr. Quackenbush to have the resolution read: "We demand that this order be rescinded." Myself and other members protested against the word "demand" and endeavored to have substituted the word "request." Mr. Quackenbush said the order took from us our constitutional rights and we were justified in demanding what rightfully belonged to us. He said the language was none too strong and insisted that the word "demand" should remain in the resolution. The committee was polled, and after a majority had voted in favor of the resolution with the word "demand" in it, no further poll was taken.

There is also an affidavit of George A. Wood, an officer of the Railway Mail Association, and a man of excellent reputation in the service. The affidavit states:

* * * While I was at the above-described meeting said Quackenbush was present and spoke upon many questions which arose for discussion; that I especially noticed his attitude of rebellion toward the laws and regulations of the Post Office Department; that the said Quackenbush spoke with great earnestness in favor of a certain resolution which was as follows * * *. (The resolution referred to was the one demanding that the Executive order be rescinded.)

Notwithstanding this evidence Mr. Stewart says: "I do not find evidence that he led an attack." In support of this statement he quotes from an affidavit prepared by Quackenbush after the hearing held last May. This affidavit was very adroitly worded by Mr. Quackenbush's attorney. The instances in which the minutes of the meeting show that Quackenbush took an active part are not disputed because he knew the department was in possession of an accurate copy of them. In other respects Quackenbush ascribes to himself a purely negative state of mind during the proceedings in question, and makes assertions in explanation of his conduct that lead only to blind passageways and are inconsistent with the reasonable deductions to be drawn from his actions. It is immaterial whether before the meeting Quackenbush knew what was going to take place or intended to take an active part. Whatever his intentions may have been, when he insisted that the word "demand" be substituted for "request" and secured its adoption, he became in fact a leader in the meeting. If there were any doubt on this point it would be removed by the fact that he made the motion to send the resolutions to the Post Office Committee. In other words, the charge that Quackenbush was the leader in the adoption of these resolutions is to be determined by what he did rather than what he says he intended.

SUPPORT OF THE HARPOON.

With reference to the charge that Quackenbush urged the clerks to support the Harpoon, Mr. Stewart refers to Quackenbush's statement that he never approved of that publication; that he never contributed any material to it, and that in subscribing for it he joined with other clerks and secured a club rate. He also refers to the fact that Quackenbush publicly denounced the idea of making the Harpoon the association paper. The charge that Quackenbush urged the clerks to support the Harpoon is founded on Wood's affidavit covering the events of the meeting of February 12, which states:

* * * That the said Quackenbush announced publicly his conviction that a certain publication printed at Denver, Colo., called "The Harpoon," was conducting an open and fearless fight for the railway postal clerks, and that it should receive the support of all clerks.

The method by which Quackenbush subscribed for this publication and the fact that he contributed nothing to its columns are immaterial. It is true that he opposed making the Harpoon the association paper in the announcement of his candidacy for president on March 9. The official organ at that time was the Railway Post Office, and if Quackenbush desired to secure publicity for his campaign it would be strange indeed if he should oppose the association's established organ. Moreover, his indorsement of the Railway Post Office came after the removal of Slocum that was based largely on his effort to secure from the association a vote of thanks for the Harpoon.

THE MOTION TO SEND A COPY OF THE RESOLUTIONS TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE POST OFFICE COMMITTEE.

Mr. Stewart believes the charge that in moving to send a copy of the resolutions to the chairman of the Post Office Committee, Quack-

enbush was guilty of conduct that was directly in violation of the Executive order, to be a "statement and inference * * * rather broader and stronger than the facts would justify as an attempt to influence legislation in the clerks' behalf." What else could have been the object? Mr. Stewart suggests nothing. The post office committees of Congress are legislative committees. This fact, it seems to me, furnishes a substantial basis for the conclusion that in sending to such a committee a copy of the resolutions demanding that the Executive order be rescinded the purpose was to influence legislative action toward this end.

THE MOVEMENT TO UNIONIZE THE CLERKS.

Mr. Stewart does not find that the record shows Quackenbush to have been the leader in the movement to unionize the clerks. He admits that Quackenbush was one of 25 clerks present at the meeting of February 26 at which McCarty, the organizer for the American Federation of Labor, explained his purpose, and that Quackenbush "ultimately put the questions to McCarty which the clerks wished answered." This much is admitted in Quackenbush's affidavit but he explains his actions on the basis that he was an innocent victim of circumstances, i. e., that he had nothing to do with the holding of the meeting; that he urged no clerk to attend; that he did not know the meeting was to be held until he had reached Boston on the same day; that he went to the meeting without any knowledge of what was going on, etc. He states that great confusion arose at this meeting and that a clerk turned to him and asked that he bring order out of chaos and have the clerks address their questions through him. I believe it to be a thoroughly reasonable inference that if confusion and chaos existed the man to whom the clerks looked to restore order was the one recognized as their leader. That is what leadership means.

Quackenbush further claims to have stated his position as definitely opposed to affiliation with the Federation of Labor in his circular letter announcing his candidacy for the office of president. This attempt to deceive the department is transparent. He could not have held this attitude while he was acting as the spokesman of the clerks at the conference with McCarty on February 26 nor when he and certain other clerks again met McCarty on March 12, a few minutes before they attended the meeting of the association at which he championed the cause of Slocum and found that he and his followers were in control of the association. Moreover, the statement that he voiced his opposition to affiliation in his circular letter announcing his candidacy is absolutely untrue. One of these circulars is in the record and bears the date of March 9, which was three days before he again conferred with McCarty. It contains no reference to the movement to unionize the clerks. It was on March 16 that he expressed his opposition to affiliation. This was after the meeting of March 12, at which he had tested his influence with the clerks and found that his election was probable. Mr. Stewart characterizes the conclusions reached as to the motives and purposes of Quackenbush as mere conjectures or inferences not evidenced by the record. To my mind the actions of Quackenbush were of such positive character as to furnish a substantial basis for drawing inferences as to his intentions. I also believe these inferences find definite support in

the fact that Quackenbush found it necessary to resort to the falsehood above mentioned, in order to deceive the department.

Certain other evidence referred to in my memorandum, though not relevant to the charges involved in the removal, are commented on by Mr. Stewart, among them the attack on clerk Strong, which I described as having been made in a manner that was very cowardly. He justifies this attack and quotes Strong as having said "in justice to the said Quackenbush I hereby state that I do not blame him for attacking me, for I feel that he thought he was entirely justified." In mentioning this occurrence the characterization of it as cowardly had reference to the manner rather than the provocation for the attack, as the record shows that Strong was seated at the time and (quoting from Strong's affidavit) "was not in a position to defend myself." In his quotation from Strong's affidavit Mr. Stewart might have added the next sentence, which shows that Quackenbush had been drinking at the time.

Mr. Stewart's objections to my review of the case seem to grow out of my having reached certain definite conclusions from the evidence instead of being left in bewildering doubt. He appears completely to have lost sight of the fact that it was Quackenbush's conspicuous leadership of a disturbing element among the clerks that brought his case to the attention of the department. The evidence supporting the charges aginst Quackenbush certainly require explanation. It may be offered on a basis which pictures him as a most unusual victim of circumstances or one that furnishes a definite connection and underlying purpose in all that he did, growing out of his ambition to be president of the Railway Mail Association of the First Division. To my mind the latter is the more reasonable.

Respectfully submitted.

A. L. Davis.

[Memorandum for Hon. F. H. Hitchcock, Postmaster General.]

March 25, 1912.

While in Boston last Monday and Tuesday, the 18th and 19th instant, I conferred with Inspector in Charge Letherman regarding conditions which might have resulted from the dismissal from the service of Charles H. Quackenbush. The inspector in charge stated that he had had a number of conferences with inspectors from all parts of his division and that it was the unanimous opinion that the railway postal clerks of that division (first), about one-half of whom at one time were followers of Mr. Quackenbush, are deserting him and that he is no longer a vital influence in that vicinity; it was also their opinion that beyond the stir caused by Mr. Quackenbush and his attempts, made personally and through his attorneys, to secure reinstatement there exists no signs of dissatisfaction or discord in the service.

Inspector in Charge Letherman informed me that he has seen letters from former supporters of Mr. Quackenbush, written to other railway postal clerks, which indicated that he has lost his standing among his late fellow employees.

One of the prime reasons for the change of sentiment, I am informed, is due to the fact that during the recent period of strife among railway postal clerks, when Mr. Quackenbush's friends elected him president

of their organization by a small majority, a resolution was passed making an extra assessment on all clerks belonging to the association for the purpose of supporting Mr. Quackenbush in his fight for reinstatement. It seems that under the rules of the association if the railway postal clerks refused to pay this assessment they would lose their insurance in the organization, and about one-half of the railway postal clerks in the association were opposed to Mr. Quackenbush. Mr. Letherman states that great dissatisfaction now exists on the part of those who were formerly with Mr. Quackenbush, on account of the assessment, and that he has lost the majority of his following.

There appears to be no dissatisfaction among the railway postal clerks at this time, and it is the unanimous opinion of the inspectors of the Boston division that there has been a complete change of feeling on the part of those clerks toward the department, and that the conditions are in splendid shape. Inspector in Charge Letherman is strongly of the opinion that the dismissal of Mr. Quackenbush and the firm attitude of the department in refusing to reinstate him have had an exceptionally good effect in stopping agitation, strife, and discord in that Railway Mail Service division.

———— ————.

Chief Inspector.

[Memorandum for Hon. F. H. Hitchcock, Postmaster General.]

MARCH 25, 1912.

In connection with the application of Charles H. Quackenbush for reinstatment in the Railway Mail Service, your special attention is called to the fact that some time during the latter part of last summer the national association of the Railway Mail Association held a contest for the purpose of electing a president of the association. It appears that Quackenbush was elected president of First Division Railway Mail Association and controlled a number of votes of the delegates at the national convention. However, he had previously been removed from the service for conduct unbecoming a faithful employee and found himself in the ridiculous position of being president of the association and at the same time out of the Railway Mail Service. He undoubtedly realized that by no process of reasoning would he, in his present condition, have any influence with departmental officers in looking after the interests of railway postal clerks.

The records show that, after having employed an attorney, he made a public statement to the effect that he proposed to be reinstated, and issued a printed request on the association to contribute money to assist in his reinstatement, maintenance, payment of his attorney, and the fight which he proposed to make.

It is evident that it would have been folly for Mr. Quackenbush to have gone to the national convention and supported a candidate for president who was spending his time denouncing the administration and promoting discord and strife among railway postal clerks; such action on his part would not have met with the approbation of the officers of the Post Office Department. His only hope, therefore, was to support some candidate who was not in opposition to the department and who was not anarchistic in his views. At this meeting some kind of a deal was made, unknown to this office, through

which Mr. Quackenbush supported P. J. Schardt, who was elected president of the association. Schardt was known to be against the ultraradical sentiment for which Mr. Quackenbush and his friends had previously stood.

On October 28, 1911, P. J. Schardt, who signed himself as president of the Railway Mail Association, addressed to me as chief inspector a letter in which he used the following language:

> The stain of removal and the mental anguish suffered by Quackenbush precludes the thought that he would ever again be guilty of a similar mistake; that the distressing experience through which he has passed will make of him a living warning against similar missteps by the younger element in the service.

It is evident from the above quotation that Mr. Schardt knew that Mr. Quackenbush was guilty of just what he had been charged and that he had been a firebrand in the service. It is perfectly apparent, but hardly susceptible of actual proof, that the manipulations that have taken place between Messrs. Quackenbush and Schardt have been for the control of the national convention and that this feature has played a considerable part in the sympathy which Mr. Schardt now exhibits in the interest of Mr. Quackenbush. I believe I am justified in making the suggestion to you that you should consider whether Mr. Quackenbush, having been unexpectedly dismissed from the service for insubordination and subsequently elected president of his division association, was not in an attitude where he was forced to frame, and did actually enter into, a deal of some kind with the present organization officers of the national association Railway Mail Association, who were recently elected, for the purpose of supporting them at the convention if they in turn would use their influence on the Second Assistant Postmaster General, and through him on you, to secure his reinstatement.

From what I can learn and the advices which reach me from post-office inspectors throughout the country, I am satisfied that if Mr. Quackenbush is reinstated, after his radical insubordination, all the other clerks who were similarly treated will demand reinstatement and that the railway mail service organization will bring the cases, one by one, to the attention of the department and press them even more assiduously than it has the case of Mr. Quackenbush. As the matter now stands, the service is quiet, without the slightest sign of discord, but if any action is taken along this line at this period it will immediately cause the reopening of all the other cases and would be followed by consequent strife and discord, which would have the support of designing persons who are anxious and willing that such a state should exist, especially at this particular season when so many political campaigns are pending.

_____, _____,
Chief Inspector.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Boston, Mass., March 30, 1912.

Hon. R. S. SHARP,
Chief Inspector, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I hand you herewith an affidavit made by John J. Kennedy, railway postal clerk, Boston and Albany Railway post office. This affidavit establishes the fact that Mr. C. H. Quackenbush attended the

meeting in March of last year, at which Mr. Frank McCarthy, organizer of the American Federation of Labor, met with the railway postal clerks to discuss the advisability of the latter joining the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Kennedy could not state positively that this meeting was held on March 12, but the fact that he identifies it as being the meeting which was attended by Mr. McCarthy satisfies me that it was the meeting of March 12, for I believe that was the meeting, and the only one, at which these matters were discussed. Mr. Kennedy informed me he thought there were about 60 railway postal clerks at that meeting. He is entirely friendly to Mr. Quackenbush, as you will note from the last paragraph of the affidavit. He insisted that he be allowed to add that to his statement that Mr. Quackenbush was present at the meeting.

I hope to obtain another affidavit for you soon. It is very hard to get any of these clerks to talk, but I think I know of one more who will.

Very respectfully, LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Inspector in Charge.

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS, *County of Suffolk, ss:*

Personally appeared before me, a post-office inspector of the United States, John J. Kennedy, who, being duly sworn, deposes and says that during the month of March, 1911, I attended a meeting in a hall on Washington Street, Boston, with a number of my brother railway mail clerks. Our attendance there was for the purpose of ascertaining what inducements the American Federation of Labor offered to the railway mail clerks to affiliate with their federation. The meeting was addressed by Frank McCarthy of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. C. H. Quackenbush was present at this meeting, but took no active part, any more than to counsel the clerks against doing anything rash, or being overhasty in deciding; and later, in literature published by him announcing his candidacy for president of the division association, he counseled the clerks against having anything to do with the American Federation of Labor, and made this part of the platform on which he was elected.

JOHN J. KENNEDY,
Railway Postal Clerk, Boston and Albany Railway Post Office.

Subscribed and sworn to at Boston, Mass., this 29th day of March, 1912, before me.

LAWRENCE LETHERMAN,
Post-Office Inspector in Charge.

EXECUTIVE ORDER.

Having considered the written arguments for and against the application for reinstatement of Charles H. Quackenbush in the Railway Mail Service, and having reached a conclusion that the offense for which Mr. Quackenbush was removed does not merit more of a penalty than a suspension without pay for a year, and that such

penalty has been satisfied, I hereby direct that Mr. Quackenbush may be reinstated in the Railway Mail Service without reference to the provisions of the civil-service rule governing reinstatements.

This order is made without the approval or disapproval of the Civil Service Commission and against the recommendation of the Postmaster General.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 22, 1912.*

○

LBMy '13

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 019 566 986 7